arXiv:1609.01575v2 [cs.CC] 20 Oct 2016

On the Existence of Weak One-Way Functions

Stefan Rass*

October 21, 2016

Abstract

This note is an attempt to unconditionally prove the existence of weak one-way function (OWF). Starting from a provably intractable decision problem L_D (whose existence is nonconstructively assured from the well-known discrete time-hierarchy theorem from complexity theory), we construct another intractable decision problem $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ that has its words scattered across $\{0,1\}^\ell$ at a relative frequency $p(\ell)$, for which upper and lower bounds can be worked out. The value $p(\ell)$ is computed from the density of the language within $\{0,1\}^\ell$ divided by the total word count 2^ℓ. It corresponds to the probability of retrieving a yes-instance of a decision problem upon a uniformly random draw from $\{0,1\}^\ell$. The trick to find a language with known bounds on $p(\ell)$ relies on switching from L_D to $L_0 := L_D \cap L'$, where L' is an easy-to-decide language with a known density across $\{0,1\}^*$. In defining L' properly (and upon a suitable Gödel numbering), the hardness of deciding $L_D \cap L'$ is inherited from L_D, while its density is controlled by that of L'. The lower and upper approximation of $p(\ell)$ then let us construct an explicit threshold function (as in random graph theory) that can be used to efficiently and intentionally sample yes- or no-instances of the decision problem (language) L_0 (however, without any auxiliary information that could ease the decision like a polynomial witness). In turn, this allows to construct a weak OWF that encodes a bit string $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ by efficiently (in polynomial time) emitting a sequence of randomly constructed intractable decision problems, whose answers correspond to the preimage w.

*Institute of Applied Informatics, System Security Group, Alpen-Adria Universität Klagenfurt, Universitätsstrasse 65-67, 9020 Klagenfurt, email: stefan.rass@aau.at

Contents

1 Preliminaries and Notation **2**
1.1 Gödel Numbering and Languages 2
1.2 One-Way Functions 3

2 Proof Outline **6**

3 Proof of Theorem 1.4 **9**
3.1 Preparation: On Density Functions 9
3.2 Preparation: Encoding of Turing Machines 10
3.3 Starting from the Time Hierarchy Theorem 12
3.4 A Hard Language with a Known Density Bound 13
3.5 Threshold Sampling 18
3.6 Counting the Random Coins in Algorithm 1 27
3.7 Partial Bijectivity 31
3.8 Conclusion: Weak one-way functions exist 34

1 Preliminaries and Notation

The presentation in the following is based on the account of [7, Chp.5]. Throughout the paper, let $\Sigma = \{0,1\}$ be the alphabet over which our strings and encodings will be defined using regular expression notation. Given a word $w \in \Sigma^*$, we write $\mathrm{len}\,(w)$ for the length of w, i.e., the number of bits $b_i \in \{0,1\}$ making up $w = b_1 b_2 \ldots b_{\mathrm{len}(w)}$. The symbol $(w)_2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathrm{len}(w)-1} 2^i \cdot b_{\mathrm{len}(w)-i}$ is the integer obtained by treating the word $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ as a binary number, with the convention of the least significant bit is located at the right end of w. In the following, we assume the reader to be familiar with Turing machines (TMs) and circuit models of computation. Our presentation will thus be confined to the minimum of necessary detail, based on the old yet excellent account of [4].

1.1 Gödel Numbering and Languages

Quite apparently, the words in Σ^* do not uniquely correspond to the elements of $\mathbb{N}$, due to the identity $(0^n w)_2 = (w)_2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $w \in \Sigma^*$ (as leading zeros would leave the "integer value" of w unchanged). Towards establishing a one-to-one mapping, a *Gödel numbering*, define the function

$$gn : \Sigma^* \to \mathbb{N}, w \mapsto (1w)_2, \tag{1}$$

where we implicitly adopt the convention $0 \notin \mathbb{N}$. The function gn thus merely prefixes its input with a "1" and returns the respective integer. It is immediately visible that gn is injective and computable, and that $gn(\Sigma^*)$ is decidable with gn^{-1} being computable on all $\mathbb{N}$. Thus, gn is an admissible Gödelization [3], and establishes a bijection between $\mathbb{N}$ and Σ^*.

A subset $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is called a *language*. Its complement set (w.r.t. Σ^*) is denoted as $\overline{L}$. For every language L, we define its *density function* as the mapping[1]

$$\mathrm{dens}_L : \Sigma^* \to \mathbb{N}, \quad x \mapsto |\{w \in L : gn(w) \leq x\}|,$$

i.e., $\mathrm{dens}_L(x)$ is the number of words whose Gödel number as defined by (1) is bounded by x.

For the Gödelization of TMs, a(ny) string encoding is useable that satisfies the following (common) assumptions; cf. [1, 4]:

1. every string over $\{0,1\}^*$ represents *some* TM (easy to assure by executing an invalid code as a canonic TM that instantly halts and rejects its input),
2. every TM is represented by infinitely many strings. This is easy by introducing the convention to ignore a prefix of the form 1^*0 then the string representation is being executed.

For a TM M, we write $\rho(M) \in \Sigma^*$ for the resulting string (encoding) that represents M, and $gn(\rho(M))$ for its integer Gödel number.

Besides Turing machines, we will also use circuits as a computational model (to properly state the relevant definitions). Circuits are here understood as a network of interconnected logical gates, all of which have a constant maximal number of input signals (bounded fan-in). For a circuit C, we write $\mathrm{size}(C)$ to mean the number of gates in C (circuit complexity). Formally, the circuit is represented as a directed acyclic graph, whose nodes are annotated with the specific functions that they compute (logical connectives, arithmetic operations, etc.). Both, TMs and circuits will be designed as decision procedures for a language L; the output is hence a single 1 or 0 bit interpreted as either "yes" or "no" for the decision problem $w \stackrel{?}{\in} L$ upon the input word w.

A complexity class is a set of languages that are decidable within the same time-limits. Concretely, for a TM M, let $time_M(w)$ denote the number of transitions that M takes to halt on input w. A language L is said to be in the complexity class $\textsc{Dtime}(t)$, if a deterministic TM exists that outputs "yes" if $w \in L$ or "no" if $w \notin L$, on input w within time $time_M(w) \leq t(\mathrm{len}\,(w))$. The language $L(M)$ decided by a TM M is defined as the set of all words $w \in \Sigma^*$ that M accepts by outputting "yes" (or any equivalent representation thereof).

1.2 One-Way Functions

Throughout this work, the symbol $\mathrm{poly}(\ell)$ will denote different (and not further specified) univariate polynomials in the variable ℓ. We call a function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ *length regular*, if $\mathrm{len}\,(w_1) = \mathrm{len}\,(w_2)$ implies $\mathrm{len}\,(f(w_1)) = \mathrm{len}\,(f(w_2))$. The function f_ℓ is defined by restricting f to inputs of length ℓ, i.e., $f_\ell := f|_{\Sigma^\ell}$. If f is length regular, then for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an integer $\ell' \leq \mathrm{poly}(\ell)$ so that

[1] Our definition essentially differs from other versions in the literature [5], which, for example, count the number of words up to a maximal length; not Gödel number.

$f_\ell : \Sigma^\ell \to \Sigma^{\ell'}$. If the converse relation $\ell' \leq \text{poly}(\ell)$ is also satisfied, then we say that f has *polynomially related input and output lengths*. This technical assumption is occasionally also stated as the existence of an integer k for which $(\text{len}\,(w))^{1/k} \leq \text{len}\,(f(w)) \leq (\text{len}\,(w))^k$. It is required to preclude trivial and uninteresting cases of one-way functions that would shrink their input down to exponentially shorter length, so that any inversion algorithm would not have enough time to expand its input up to the original size. Polynomially related input and output lengths avoid this construction, which is neither useful in cryptography nor in complexity theory [7].

With this preparation, we can state the general definition of one-way functions, for which we prove non-emptiness in a particular special case (Definition 1.3):

Definition 1.1 (one-way function; cf. [7])**.** *Let $\varepsilon : \mathbb{N} \to [0,1]$ and $S : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be two functions that are considered as parameters. A length regular function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ with polynomially related input and output lengths is a* (ε, S)-one-way function*, if both of the following conditions are met:*

1. *There is a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm M such that, for all $w \in \Sigma^*$, $M(w) = f(w)$*
2. *For all sufficiently large ℓ and for any circuit C with size$(C) \leq S(\ell)$,*

$$\Pr_{w \in \Sigma^\ell}\left[C(f_\ell(w)) \in f_\ell^{-1}(f_\ell(w))\right] < \varepsilon(\ell) \tag{2}$$

Observe that Definition 1.1 does not require f to be a bijection (we will exploit this degree of freedom later).

In Definition 1.1, we can w.l.o.g. replace the deterministic algorithm to evaluate an OWF by a probabilistic such algorithm, considering the understanding of a probabilistic TM as being a particular type of *nondeterministic* TM that admits at most two choices per transition [6]. This creates a total of $\leq 2^n$ execution branches over k steps in time. Assuming a uniformly random bit $b \in \{0,1\}$ to determine the next configuration (where the transition is ambiguous), we can equivalently think of the probabilistic TM using a total of k stochastically independent bits (denoted by ω) to define one particular execution branch B, with likelihood $\Pr_\omega[B] = 2^{-k}$. In this notation, $\omega \in \{0,1\}^k$ is an auxiliary string that, for each ambiguous transition, pins down the next configuration to be taken. So we can think as a probabilistic TM to act *deterministically* on its input word w *and* an *auxiliary input* $\omega \in \{0,1\}^k$, whose bits are chosen uniformly and stochastically independent. This view of probabilistic TM as deterministic TM with auxiliary input will become important in later stages of the proof.

For cryptographic purposes, we are specifically interested in strong one-way functions, which are defined as follows:

Definition 1.2 (strong one-way function; cf. [7])**.** *A length-regular function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ with polynomially related input and output lengths is a* strong one-way function *if for any polynomial p, f is $(\frac{1}{p(\ell)}, p(\ell))$-one-way.*

Actually, a much weaker requirement can be imposed, as strong one-way functions can efficiently be constructed from weak one-way functions (see [7, Thm.5.2.1] for a proof), defined as:

Definition 1.3 (weak one-way function; cf. [7])**.** *A length-regular function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ with polynomially related input and output lengths is a* weak one-way function *if there is a polynomial q such that for any polynomial p, f is $(1 - \frac{1}{q(\ell)}, p(\ell))$-one-way.*

Our main result is the following, here stated in its short version:

Theorem 1.4. *Weak one-way functions exist (unconditionally).*

The rest of the paper is devoted to proving this claim. As a well-known implication, we obtain the following separation theorem:

Corollary 1.5. $\mathrm{P} \neq \mathrm{NP}$.

The unconditionality of Corollary 1.5 hinges on Theorem 1.4 to be true. Note that some proof techniques, such as relativization, are known to fail in deducing Corollary 1.5, which in turn tells us to avoid any such method when proving Theorem 1.4. Before that, however, we give a proof of Corollary 1.5 for convenience of the reader.

Proof (conditional on Theorem 1.4). Let $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ be a strong one-way function, whose existence is implied by that of weak one-way functions by [7, Thm.5.2.1]. W.l.o.g., we may assume $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ (otherwise, we just use a prefix-free binary encoding to represent all symbols in the finite alphabet Σ). Moreover, let $gn : \Sigma^* \to \mathbb{N}$ be a Gödel numbering, for which $gn(w)$ and $gn^{-1}(n)$ are both computable in polynomial time in $\mathrm{len}\,(w)$ and $\log(n)$, respectively. Our choice here is the function gn from Section 1.1. We put $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ as $g := gn \circ f \circ gn^{-1}$, and observe that by (1), g inherits the length regularity property from f (where the integer n has a length $\mathrm{len}\,(n) \in \Theta(\log n)$ equal to the number of bits needed to represent it). Furthermore, g is as well strongly one-way: if it were not, i.e., if $g^{-1}(n)$ would be computable in time $\mathrm{poly}(\log n)$, then

$$f^{-1} = gn^{-1} \circ g^{-1} \circ gn \tag{3}$$

would also be computable in time $\mathrm{poly}(\mathrm{len}\,(w))$ (since gn and gn^{-1} are both efficiently computable). Precisely, if some circuit C of $\mathrm{size}(C) \leq \mathrm{poly}(\log n)$ computes $C(n) \in g^{-1}(n)$ with a likelihood of $\geq 1/\mathrm{poly}(\log n)$, then each of these cases is "positive" for the computation of f^{-1} on the entirety of the preimage set $\{0,1\}^{\ell}$ with $\ell \in \Theta(\log n)$ (where the Θ is due to the application of gn and gn^{-1}). This means that the circuit C could be extended into a (polynomial size) circuit C' that evaluates f^{-1} according to (3) correctly with a likelihood $\geq 1/\mathrm{poly}(\Theta(\ell))$, contradicting the strong one-wayness of f.

Upon g, we define a language

$$L_g := \left\{(y, N) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : \exists x \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \text{ with } g(x) = y\right\},$$

in which every pair (y, N) can be represented by a word $w \in \{0,1\}^{\Theta(\log y + \log N)} \in \Sigma^*$ using a proper prefix-free encoding (which includes the symbols to separate the binary strings for y and N). That is, L_g is the set of y for which a preimage within a specified (numeric) range $[1, N]$ exists. Our goal is showing that $L_g \in \mathrm{NP}$ but $L_g \notin \mathrm{P}$.

The observation that $L_g \in \mathrm{NP}$ is immediate, since a preimage x for $y \in \mathbb{N}$ has length $O(\log x)$, so it can act as a polynomial witness, guessed by a nondeterministic TM to decide $1 \leq x \leq N$ and $g(x) = y$, both doable in time $O(\mathrm{poly}(\log x))$ (as g is length-regular and strongly one-way).

Conversely, if we assume $L_g \in \mathrm{P}$, then we could efficiently compute $x = g^{-1}(y)$ for every given $y \in \mathbb{N}$ by the following method: since g is length regular, it satisfies $\mathrm{len}\,(y) = \mathrm{len}\,(g(x)) \geq \mathrm{len}\,(x)^{1/k}$, where $\mathrm{len}\,(x) \in O(\log x)$ when x is treated as a word in binary representation. Thus, we have the upper bound $\log(x) \in O((\log y)^k)$, and therefore x lies inside the discrete interval $I = \{1, 2, \ldots, N = c \cdot \lceil 2^{(\log y)^k} \rceil\}$ for some constant $c > 0$ and sufficiently large x (implied by a sufficiently large y via the length-regularity of g). With the so-computed N, we run a binary search on I: per iteration, we can invoke the polynomial-time decision algorithm A available for $L_g \in \mathrm{P}$ to decide whether to take the left half (if A returns "yes") or the right half (if A returns "no") of the current search space. After $O(\log N) = O((\log y)^k)$ iterations, the interval has been narrowed down to contain a single number x_0, which is the sought preimage of y. The whole procedure takes $O((\log y)^k) \cdot \mathrm{poly}(\log y)$ steps (one decision of L_g per iteration of the binary search), and thus is polynomial in $\log y$ since k is a constant. Therefore, g^{-1} would be computable in $O(\mathrm{poly}(\log y))$ steps in the worst case. Since our choice of y was arbitrary, it follows that g^{-1} takes $O(\mathrm{poly}(\log y))$ in *all* cases, which clearly contradicts the average-case hardness of the strong one-way function g. Hence, $L_g \notin \mathrm{P}$, and $\mathrm{P} \neq \mathrm{NP}$ consequently. □

Now, let us turn to the proof of the main theorem 1.4.

2 Proof Outline

Continuing the outline in the abstract, we will start from a preliminary definition of an OWF that will successively be modified into the final construction. Take some (difficult to decide) language L and consider the mapping

$$w = b_0 b_1 \ldots b_\ell \in \{0,1\}^\ell \mapsto (w_{b_0}, w_{b_1}, \ldots, w_{b_\ell}) \in L^\ell,$$

where for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$, we use some (random)

$$w_{b_i} \in \begin{cases} L, & \text{if } b_i = 1; \\ \overline{L}, & \text{if } b_i = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

A first seemingly suitable language L will be found by inspecting the proof of the time hierarchy theorem 3.5 in Section 3.3: Upon certainly related functions $t, T : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, Theorem 3.5 constructs a language L_D that is decidable in

$T(\ell)$ steps but not decidable within $t(\ell)$ steps for words of length ℓ. For our OWF, we will choose t to be superpolynomial but subexponential, and T to be exponential (we cannot set T to anything larger than 2^ℓ, since finding a preimage for a function $f : \{0,1\}^\ell \to \{0,1\}^{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)}$ is never more expensive than successively testing all 2^ℓ words to map to the given image $f(w_0)$).

Note that our use of the hierarchy theorem is not towards contradicting it upon assuming the absence of one-way functions. Apparently, there is no inconsistency in the claim of Theorem 1.4 and the asserted truth of Theorem 3.5, due to the hardness of OWF being measured by average case complexity, whereas the hierarchy theorem speaks about worst-case complexity. Therefore, our construction of the language L in (4) will be based on the theorem's implied language L_D, but suitably modify it into another language $L = \mathcal{L}_N$ (whose construction is sketch across the next paragraphs) to make the worst case of the related decision problem occur with the frequency as desired in Definition 1.3.

The necessary modification includes using a (wasteful) encoding of TMs introduced in Section 3.2. It is important to define this *before* proving the hierarchy theorem 3.5, since the language L_D must be constructed using this particular encoding (though we will make explicit use of it not until near the end of the proof).

So far, this is still only half the story, since we need a way to efficiently sample yes- and no-instances of the decision problem $w \stackrel{?}{\in} L$, according to the prescription in (4). To this end, we will randomly draw words from an urn $U \subset \{0,1\}^*$ of size $N = |U|$ elements at a rate that (probabilistically) either assures or avoids retrieving an element from L. The density functions introduced in Section 1 will be the technical vehicle to quantify the likelihood of hitting L_D within U.

Because L_D arises from a diagonalization argument within the proof of Theorem 3.5 (reviewed in Section 3.3), its scattering over $\{0,1\}^*$ and so the likelihood to draw from the subset $U \cap L_D$ cannot be captured directly. To fix this, we will intersect L_D with the set SQ of integer squares (called L' in the abstract), which are scattered over $\mathbb{N}$ in a trivial pattern (and whose density is worked out explicitly in Section 3.1). Section 3.4 then continues to define the new language $L_0 = L_D \cap SQ$ as a (still not final) replacement for L_D in (4), showing that the hardness of deciding L_0 is inherited from L_D. Also, the known density of SQ lets us find an upper bound (Lemma 3.6) and a lower bound (using a reduction argument as Lemma 3.7) to the density of L_0 up to a given limit, which is the numerically maximal element of U (in terms of its Gödel numbering). The result is a provably hard-to-decide language L_0 with known bounds to its density function (Lemma 3.9).

Still, having an approximate frequency of words from L_0 to occur in $\{0,1\}^\ell$ quantified by Lemma 3.9 is not enough, as we cannot deliberately choose to hit or miss L_0 within $\{0,1\}^\ell$ upon random draws, depending on whether we seek a yes- or no-instance in (4). Towards controlling the sampling in the desired way, we will again modify L_0 into the family $\mathcal{L}_N$ of N-element sets $W \subseteq U \subset \Sigma^\ell$, with the property that $W \in \mathcal{L}_N \iff W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset$.

For $\mathcal{L}_N$, we will show that it is still difficult to decide (Lemma 3.10), so that L_0 can finally be replaced by $\mathcal{L}_N$ in (4) towards the final definition of our OWF by (40). More importantly, the property of a set W to contain a word from L_0 is monotone, so it has a threshold function [2]. The crucial feature for our purposes is the fact that depending on whether few or many elements are drawn from U relative to the entirety of it, the event of getting at least one element from L_0, i.e., a yes-instance of $\mathcal{L}_N$, has a likelihood of either zero or one in the limit as $N \to \infty$.

That is, in making the size $N = \mathrm{poly}(\ell)$ of the urn U large and with Lemma 3.9 helping to bound the likelihood $p(N)$ to hit an element of L_0 among $U \subseteq \Sigma^\ell$, we can choose to draw yes- or no-instances of $\mathcal{L}_N$ by either sampling more or less elements than what the threshold function tells us. We call this technique *threshold sampling* and develop its details in Section 3.5.

The main insight herein is the fact that threshold sampling either draws an element from L_0, or avoids this, both with high probability, depending on the input bit b_i (as prescribed by (4)). Moreover, what counts for the threshold is the *relative* number of elements drawn from U, so instead of drawing few elements for a no- and many elements for a yes-instance of $W \cap L_0 \stackrel{?}{=} \emptyset$, we will draw *the same* number m of elements from urns U of *different size* (small urn for a yes-instance; large urn for a no-instance). The exact likelihood of an error in this procedure is quantified by Lemma 3.13, and asymptotically approaches zero, by virtue of the threshold. The key point, however, is that our threshold sampling Algorithm 1 itself has no information to efficiently decide which elements in the output set W were drawn from L_0 or its complement. This is because the size of the urn remains internal knowledge to the sampling algorithm and does not show up in its output (otherwise, it would provide a trivial auxiliary information to quickly invert the mapping (4)).

It then remains to specify the details of the uniformly random draws. Specifically, we will take the random coins ω directly from the input word w and only map the remainder of the input using the randomness ω. Section 3.6 is devoted to counting the necessary lot of bits, showing it to be $\mathrm{poly}(\mathrm{len}\,(w))$. In this regard, we make use of the fact that Definition 1.1 does not require an OWF to be a bijection. Instead, it is only necessary that every circuit errs on inverting the function only on a prescribed fraction of cases. Section 3.7 quantifies this error rate by restricting invertibility to refer only on the first bit of the input, and by using the encoding of TMs introduced at the beginning in Section 3.2. The idea is that any circuit that errs on the first bit has already made the necessary error. This inversion error, together with the only asymptotically assured correctness of the sampling will establish condition (2) of Definition 1.1. That argument is made rigorous in Section 3.8, where also the remaining properties of weak one-way functions are verified.

Having said this, let us move on to the formal details.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

The proof will cook up a weak OWF from the ingredients outlined in Section 2, in the logical order induced by the described intuition. Throughout this work, all logarithms have base 2, unless stated otherwise.

3.1 Preparation: On Density Functions

The definition of density functions immediately delivers a first useful inequality: for every two languages L_1, L_2, we have

$$\mathrm{dens}_{L_1 \cap L_2} \leq \mathrm{dens}_{L_1}, \tag{5}$$

since there cannot be more words in $L_1 \cap L_2$ than words in L_1 (or L_2, respectively).

Our first subgoal is the ability to construct random yes- and no-instances of a difficult decision problem. So, we first need to relate the density function for a language L to the likelihood of retrieving elements from it upon uniformly random draws. In the following, let L be arbitrary but fixed.

Lemma 3.1. *For every language L, the density function satisfies $dens_L(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Assume the opposite, i.e., the existence of some x_0 for which $\mathrm{dens}_L(x_0) > x_0$. In that case, there must be at least $x_0 + 1$ words $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{x_0+1}$ in L for which $gn(w_i) \leq x_0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, x_0+1$. W.l.o.g., let w_1 be the word whose Gödel number $gn(w_1)$ is maximal. Since gn is injective, all other x_0 words map to distinct smaller integers, thus making $gn(w_1) \geq x_0 + 1$ at least. This clearly contradicts our assumption that $gn(w_1) \leq x_0$. □

Lemma 3.1 permits the use of the density function to define an urn experiment as follows: let the urn be $U = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, and let each element in it correspond to a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ by virtue of gn^{-1}. Then the likelihood to draw an element from L addressed by a random index in U is $\mathrm{dens}_L(n)/n$, by counting the number of positive cases relative to all cases.

To illustrate the practical use of a density function, let us consider the following example of a language that we will heavily use throughout this work. The language of *integer squares* is defined as $SQ = \left\{y : y = x^2, x \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$. Each element $y \in SQ$ can be identified with a string (in regular expression notation) $w_y \in 1(0 \cup 1)^* \in \Sigma^*$, for which $y = (w_y)_2$. The Gödel number of w_y can be computed from y by $gn(w_y) = 2^{\lceil \log y \rceil + c(y)} + y$, with the padding function

$$c(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \log y < \lceil \log y \rceil\,; \\ 1, & \text{if } \log y = \lceil \log y \rceil\,. \end{cases}$$

Let us extend our definition of gn to a mapping from $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, where $gn(y)$ for $y \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined as $gn(y) := gn(w_y)$ with $y = (w_y)_2$. Using the previous

formula to compute $gn(y)$, note that the expression

$$\frac{gn(y)}{y} = \frac{2^{\lceil \log y \rceil + c(y)} + y}{y} = 1 + \frac{2^{\lceil \log y \rceil + c(y)}}{y},$$

ultimately becomes numerically trapped within the interval $[1, 5]$ for $y \to \infty$ (the lower bound is immediate; the upper bound follows from $2^{\lceil \log y \rceil + c(y)} \leq 2^{1+(\log y)+1} = 4y$). Thus,

$$y \leq gn(y) \leq 5 \cdot y \quad \text{for sufficiently large } y. \tag{6}$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that for $z, x \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left|\left\{z^2 : z^2 \leq x\right\}\right| = \left\lfloor \sqrt{x} \right\rfloor. \tag{7}$$

Using both facts, we discover that for any two $x, z \in \mathbb{N}$ that satisfy $gn(z^2) \leq x$, also $z^2 \leq gn(z^2) \leq x$ holds by (6). Thus, $[gn(z^2) \leq x] \Rightarrow [z^2 \leq x]$ and hence $\left\{z^2 : gn(z^2) \leq x\right\} \subseteq \left\{z^2 : z^2 \leq x\right\}$. The cardinalities of these sets satisfy the respective inequality, and (7) gives

$$\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(x) \leq \left\lfloor \sqrt{x} \right\rfloor \leq \sqrt{x}. \tag{8}$$

Conversely, $gn(z^2) \leq 5z^2$ asymptotically by (6) means that for sufficiently large z, $gn(z^2) \leq 5 \cdot z^2 \iff \frac{1}{5} \cdot gn(z^2) \leq z^2$. Thus, $[z^2 \leq x] \Rightarrow [\frac{1}{5} \cdot gn(z^2) \leq x]$, and the last condition is equivalent to $gn(z^2) \leq 5 \cdot x$. Therefore, $\left\{z^2 : z^2 \leq x\right\} \subseteq \left\{z^2 : gn(z^2) \leq 5 \cdot x\right\}$, and the cardinalities satisfy the respective inequality. It follows that $\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(5 \cdot x) \in \Omega(\sqrt{x})$, or after substituting and renaming the variables, $\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(x) \in \Omega(\sqrt{x})$.

Summarizing our findings, we have proved:

Lemma 3.2. *The language of squares* $SQ = \left\{y : y = x^2, x \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ *has a density function* $dens_{SQ}(x) \in \Theta(\sqrt{x})$.

3.2 Preparation: Encoding of Turing Machines

As a purely technical matter, we will adopt a specific encoding convention for TMs. While the following facts are almost trivial, it is important to establish them a-priori (and thus independently) of our upcoming arguments, since the scattering and density of the languages that we construct will depend on the chosen encoding scheme of TMs. Specifically, we will encode a TM M into a string $\rho(M)$ as outlined in Section 1.1, with a few adaptations when it comes to executing a code for a TM:

- When a TM as specified by an input $w \in \Sigma^*$ is to be executed by a universal TM M_U, then the code $\rho(M)$ that defines M's actions is obtained by U as follows:
  - the input w is treated as an integer $x = (w)_2$ in binary and all but the most significant $\lceil \log(\mathrm{len}\,(w)) \rceil$ bits are ignored. Call the resulting word w'.

– from w', we drop all preceding 1-bits and the first 0-bit, i.e., if $w' = 1^k 0 v$, then $\rho(M) = v$ after discarding the prefix padding $1 \ldots 10$.



Figure 1: Encoding of Turing machines with padding

Remark 3.3. *Note that exponential difference in the size of $\rho(M)$ and its representation w in fact does* not *preclude the efficient execution of w as input code and data to the universal TM, because it only executes a logarithmically small fraction of its input code. Conversely, the wastefulness of our encoding only means that we have to reach out exponentially far on $\mathbb{N}$ to see the first occurrence of a TM with a code of given size; this is, however, not forbidden by any of the relevant definitions.*

Although this encoding – depicted in Figure 1 – is incredibly wasteful (as the code for a TM is taken as padded with an exponential lot of bits, it assures several properties that will become useful at the beginning and near the end of this work:

1. The aforementioned mapping $w \mapsto w'$ shrinks the entirety of 2^ℓ words in $\{0,1\}^\ell$ down to only $2^{\lceil \log \ell \rceil} \geq \ell$ distinct prefixes. Each of these admits a lot of $2^{\ell - \lceil \log \ell \rceil}$ suffixes that are irrelevant for the encoding of the TM. Thus, an arbitrary word w' encoding a TM has at least

$$2^{\ell - \lceil \log \ell \rceil} \geq 2^{\ell - \log \ell - 1} \tag{9}$$

   equivalents w in the set $\{0,1\}^\ell$ that map to w'. Thus, if a TM M is encoded within ℓ bits, then (9) counts how many equivalent codes for M are found at least in $\{0,1\}^\ell$. This will be used in the concluding Section 3.8, when we establish failure of any inversion circuit in a polynomial number of cases (second part of Definition 1.1).

2. The retraction of preceding 1-bits creates the needed infinitude of equivalent encodings of *every* possible TM M, as we can embed any code $\rho(M)$ in a word of length ℓ for which $\log(\ell) > \operatorname{len}(\rho(M))$. We will need this to prove the hierarchy theorem in Section 3.3.

Let $\mathcal{TM} = \{M_1, M_2, M_3, \ldots\}$ be an enumeration of all TMs under the encoding just described; that is, $\mathcal{TM}$ is the set of all $w \in \Sigma^*$ for which a TM M with encoding $\rho(M)$ exists that is embedded inside w as shown in Figure 1. Observe that the first 1-bit (mandatory in our encoding) when being stripped

from a word w by gn^{-1} leaves the inner representation of M intact (since the 1^+0-prefix is ignored for the "execution" of w anyway). We write M_w to mean the TM encoded by w.

A simulation by the universal TM M_U thus takes the program w and input x to act on the initial tape configuration $\#w\#x\underline{\#}$, or in expanded form (cf. Figure 1),

$$\#\underbrace{1^+0}_{\substack{\text{padding}\\(\text{ignored})}}\overbrace{\rho(M)}^{\text{code}}\underbrace{1^*(0\cup 1)^*}_{\substack{\text{padding}\\(\text{ignored})}}\#x\underline{\#} \tag{10}$$

where # marks spaces on the tape, and the head position is marked by the underlining.

3.3 Starting from the Time Hierarchy Theorem

Returning to the proof outline, our next goal is to find a proper difficult language L_D that we can use for the encoding of input bits into yes/no instances of a decision problem. To this end, it is useful to take a close look at the proof of the deterministic time hierarchy theorem known from complexity theory. The theorem's hypothesis is summarized as follows:

Assumption 3.4. *Let $T : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a time-constructible function, and let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a monotonously increasing function for which*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{t(n)\cdot \log t(n)}{T(n)} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.5 is obtained by diagonalization [4, Thm.12.9]: we construct a TM M that halts within no more than $T(\text{len}\,(w))$ steps upon input of a word w of length n, and differs in its output from every other TM M' that is $t(n)$-time-limited.

On input of a word w of length $\ell = \text{len}\,(w)$, the sought TM M will employ a universal TM M_U to simulate an execution of M_w on input w. The simulation of $t(\ell)$ steps of M_w can be done by M taking no more than $c_{M_w}\cdot t(\ell)\log t(\ell)$ steps [4, Thm.12.6], where c_{M_w} is a constant that depends only on the number of states, tapes, and tape-symbols that M_w uses, but not the length of the input to (M's simulation of) M_w.

To assure that M always halts within the limit $T(\ell)$, it simultaneously executes a "stopwatch" TM M_T on the input w, which exists since T is fully time-constructible. Once M_T has finished, M terminates the simulation of M_w too, and outputs "accept" if and only if two conditions are met:

1. M_w halted (by itself) during the simulation (i.e., it was not interrupted by the termination of M_T), and,
2. M_w rejected w.

The "diagonal-language" L_D is thus defined over the alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ as

$$L_D := \{w \in \Sigma^* : M_w \text{ halts and rejects } w \text{ within} \leq T(\text{len}\,(w)) \text{ steps}\}\,. \quad (11)$$

The hierarchy theorem is then found by observing that L_D cannot be accepted by any t-time-limited TM M: If M were t-time-limited with encoding $\rho(M) = w'$, then the list $\mathcal{TM}$ contains another (equivalent) encoding w of length $\ell = \text{len}\,(w)$ so that $M = M_{w'}$ and M_w compute identical functions, and

$$c_{M_w} \cdot t(\ell) \cdot \log t(\ell) \leq T(\ell), \quad (12)$$

so that M_w can carry to completion within the time limit $T(\ell)$. Now, $w \in L(M_w)$ implies $w \notin L_D$, so that $L_D \neq L(M_w)$. Since M was t-time-limited and arbitrary, and M_w decides the same language as M, we have $L_D \neq L(M)$ for all M that are t-time-limited, and therefore $\textsc{Dtime}(t) \subsetneq \textsc{Dtime}(T)$.

At this point, we just re-proved the following well-known result:

Theorem 3.5 (deterministic time hierarchy theorem)**.** *Let t, T be as in Assumption 3.4, then* $\textsc{Dtime}(t) \subsetneq \textsc{Dtime}(T)$.

3.4 A Hard Language with a Known Density Bound

The existence of a language L_D that is hard to decide allows the construction of another language whose scattering over Σ^* can be quantified explicitly. We will intersect L_D with another language with known density estimates, and show that the hardness of the implied decision problem is retained. Our language of choice will be already known set of integer squares, $SQ := \left\{x^2 : x \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$, having $\text{dens}_{SQ}(x) \in \Theta(\sqrt{x})$ by Lemma 3.2.

We claim that the language

$$L_0 := L_D \cap SQ$$

is at least as difficult to decide as L_D. Assume the opposite $L_0 \in \textsc{Dtime}(t)$ towards a contradiction, and let a word $w \in \Sigma^\ell$ be given. To ease our notation in this subsection (and only here), we let w synonymously denote a bistring or the represented integer $(w)_2$. Cast w into the smallest square $w' = \lceil\sqrt{w}\rceil^2 \geq w$ that approximates w from above, and observe that two adjacent integer squares x^2 and $(x+1)^2$ are separated by no more than $(x+1)^2 - x^2 = 2x+1$. Therefore, putting $x = \lceil\sqrt{w}\rceil$, we find that the difference Δ between w and its upper square approximation w' satisfies $w' - w = \Delta \leq 2\lceil\sqrt{w}\rceil + 1$. Taking logarithms to get the bitlength, we find that Δ takes no more than $\lceil\log(2\lceil\sqrt{w}\rceil + 1)\rceil \leq 3 + \frac{1}{2}\lceil\log w\rceil = 3 + \frac{\text{len}(w)}{2}$ bits.

By adding Δ to w to get the sought square $w' = w + \Delta$, note that the shorter bitlength of Δ relative to w makes w and w' different in the lower half + 4 bits (including the carry from the addition of Δ). Equivalently, w and w' have a Hamming distance $\leq \frac{1}{2}\,\text{len}\,(w) + 4$.

Since $\ell - \log(\ell) > 4 + \frac{1}{2}\log(\ell)$ for sufficiently large ℓ, we conclude that w and its square approximation w' will eventually have an identical lot of $\lceil\log \ell\rceil$

most significant bits (cf. Figure 1). That is, the header of the word that is relevant for L_D is not touched when w is converted into a square number w'. This means that $w \in L_D \iff w' \in L_D$, so that the decision remains unchanged upon the switch from w to w'. Since $w' \in SQ$ holds by construction, we could decide $w \in L_D$ by deciding whether $w' \in L_D \iff w' \in L_D \cap SQ$, so that $L_D \in \textsc{Dtime}(t)$ by our initial assumption on L_0. This contradiction puts $L_0 \notin \textsc{Dtime}(t)$, as claimed. To retain $L_D \cap SQ \in \textsc{Dtime}(T)$, we must choose T so large that the decision $w \in SQ$ is possible within the time limit incurred by T, so we add $T(n) \geq n^3$ to our hypothesis besides Assumption 3.4 (note that we do not need an optimal complexity bound here).

Using (5) with $L_1 = L_D$ and $L_2 = SQ$, we see that for sufficiently large x,

$$\mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(x) = \mathrm{dens}_{L_D \cap SQ}(x) \leq \mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(x) \leq \sqrt{x},$$

by (8). This proves half of what we need, so let us capture this intermediate finding in a rememberable form:

Lemma 3.6. *Let t, T be as in Assumption 3.4 and assume $T(n) \geq n^3$. Then, there exists a language $L_0 \in \textsc{Dtime}(T) \setminus \textsc{Dtime}(t)$ for which*

$$dens_{L_0}(x) \leq \sqrt{x}.$$

Towards a lower bound for the density, the following observation will turn out as a key tool:

Lemma 3.7. *The language L_0 described in Lemma 3.6 is $\textsc{Dtime}(t)$-hard (via polynomial reduction).*

Proof. We need to show that for every $L \in \textsc{Dtime}(t)$, there exists a poly-time reduction φ to the language L_0. Remember that by definition (11), L_D is the set of all words w that when being interpreted as an encoding of a Turing machine M_w, this machine would reject "itself" as input within time $T(\mathrm{len}\,(w))$.

Take any $L \in \textsc{Dtime}(t)$, then there is a TM M_L that decides $w \stackrel{?}{\in} L$ in time $t(\mathrm{len}\,(w))$. Let $M_{\overline{L}}$ be the TM that decides $\overline{L}$ (i.e., by simply inverting the answer of M_L). To construct a proper member of $L_D \cap SQ$ that equivalently delivers this answer, we define the reduction $\varphi(w) = w' = \rho(M_{\overline{L}})\$w\$0^\nu$ for an integer ν that is specified later. That is, the word w' contains a description of $M_{\overline{L}}$, followed by the original input w and a number ν of trailing zeroes that will later be used to cast this word into a square. The three blocks in $\varphi(w)$ are separated by \$-symbol, assuming that \$ is not used in any of the relevant tape alphabets.

Let us collect a few useful observations about the mapping φ:

- $\varphi(w)$ is poly-time computable when $\nu = \mathrm{poly}(\mathrm{len}\,(w))$, since $\rho(M_{\overline{L}})$ is merely a constant prefix being attached. It is especially crucial to remark here that the exponential expansion of a TM of length ℓ into an encoding of size $O(2^\ell)$ (cf. Remark 3.3) *does not* make the complexity to evaluate φ exponential, since the universal TM M_U merely drops padding from

the code, but not from the entire input word. Indeed, the (padded) code $1^+0\rho(M_{\overline{L}})1^*(0\cup 1)^*$ appearing on the TM's tape (see (10)) is exponentially longer than the "pure" code for $M_{\overline{L}}$, but it is nevertheless a *constant* prefix used by the reduction φ. As such, its attachment is doable in $O(1)$ time.

A slight difficulty arises from the need to make $\varphi(w) = w'$ sufficiently long to give the simulation of $M_{w'}$ enough time to finish. This is resolved by increasing ν (thus making the zero-trailer 0^ν longer), so as to enlarge w' until condition (12) is satisfied. Note that the increase of ν depends on t and T only and is as such a fixed number (constant).

- The output length $\text{len}\,(\varphi(w))$ is again polynomial in $\text{len}\,(w)$ under the condition that $\nu = \text{poly}(\text{len}\,(w))$.

- φ is injective, since $w_1 \neq w_2$ implies $\varphi(w_1) \neq \varphi(w_2)$.

To see why $w \in L \iff \varphi(w) = w' \in L_D$, let us agree on the convention that the TM $M_{\varphi(w)}$ executes $M_{\overline{L}}$ only on that part of w' that is enclosed within \$-symbols. Leaving our universal TM unmodified, this restriction can be implemented by a proper modification of $M_{\overline{L}}$ to ignore everything before and after the \$-symbols during its execution (thus slightly changing the definition of our reduction to respect this). Let us call the so-modified TM $M'_{\overline{L}}$, and alter the reduction into $\varphi(w) := \rho(M'_{\overline{L}})\$w\$0^\nu$.

Under these modifications, it is immediate that:

1. the simulation of M'_w on input w' is actually a simulation of $M_{\overline{L}}$ on input w, and has – by construction (a suitably large padding of ν trailing bits) – enough time to finish, and,

2. the TM deciding L_D will accept w' if and only if $M_{\overline{L}}$ rejects w. In that case, however, M_L would have accepted w, thus $w \in L \iff \varphi(w) \in L_D$.

It remains to modify our reduction a last time to assure that $\varphi(w) \in SQ$ for *every* possible w, so as to complete the reduction $L \leq_p L_0$. For that matter, we will utilize the previously introduced trailer of zeroes 0^ν in $\varphi(w)$.

Define the number $k := \text{len}\left(\rho(M'_{\overline{L}})\$w\$\right) = c + \text{len}\,(w)$, where c is a constant that counts the length of $\rho(M'_{\overline{L}})$ and the \$-symbols when everything is encoded in binary. We will enforce $\varphi(w) \in SQ$ by interpreting $w' = \rho(M'_{\overline{L}})\$w\$0^\nu$ as a binary number with ν trailing zeroes, and add a proper value to it so as to cast w' into the form $w' = x^2$ for some integer x. The argument is exactly as in the proof of Lemma 3.6, and thus not repeated but visualized in Figure 2.

Now, let ν be such that $\text{len}\,(w') = \lambda \cdot k$ for some (sufficiently large) integer multiple $\lambda \geq 3$ (see Figure 2 to see how $\nu, \text{len}\,(w'), k$ and λ are related). To cast $\varphi(w)$ into the sought form $x^2 \in SQ$, we need to add some Δ (to reach a square). If we choose λ so large that $3 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \cdot k < (\lambda - 1)k$, then $\nu \geq (\lambda - 1)k$ zero-bits (plus the additional lot to satisfy condition (12) if necessary) at the end of w' suffice to take up all bits of Δ, and $(\rho(M'_{\overline{L}})\$w\$0^\nu)_2 + \Delta = (\rho(M'_{\overline{L}})\$w\$0^*z)_2$ (with z being the binary representation of Δ) is a square. Since λ can be chosen as a fixed



Figure 2: Mapping into the set of squares



Figure 3: Illustration of inequality (13)

integer multiplier for $k = c + \mathrm{len}\,(w)$, the above requirement $\nu = \mathrm{poly}(\mathrm{len}\,(w))$ is satisfied, and $\varphi(w) \in SQ$ holds for *every* input word w.

Therefore, $\forall w : \varphi(w) \in SQ$ implies $w \in L \iff w \in L_D \cap SQ \iff w \in L_D$, and the result follows since $L \in \textsc{Dtime}(t)$ was arbitrary. □

Lemma 3.7 lets us lower bound the number of words in L_0 by using any known lower bound for any language in $\textsc{Dtime}(t)$, and knowing that all these words map into L_0 (see Figure 3). Our language of choice will be SQ once again, with Lemma 3.2 providing the necessary bounds. This is admissible if we add the hypothesis $t(n) \geq n^3$ so that $SQ \in \textsc{Dtime}(t)$. Furthermore, Assumption 3.4 then implies that $T(n) \in \Omega(n^3)$ as well, so that this requirement in Lemma 3.6 becomes redundant under our so-extended hypothesis.

We consider the length of word w being mapped to a word $\varphi(w) \in L_0 = L_D \cap SQ$. By definition, there are $\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(x)$ many words being mapped to $\mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(\varphi(x))$ many words, since φ is by construction monotonously increasing (recall that two words $w_1 \leq w_2$ would appear as "middle" blocks in the bistrings $\varphi(w_1), \varphi(w_2)$, where they determine the order $\varphi(w_1) \leq \varphi(w_2)$, as the remaining higher-order bits are the same in both, $\varphi(w_1)$ and $\varphi(w_2)$, and the lower-order bits contributed by the individual Δ cannot change the ordering). This means that

$$\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(x) \leq \mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(\varphi(x)), \tag{13}$$

because at least the words w up to $gn(w) \leq x$ in SQ are contained in L_0 when being restricted up to $\varphi(x)$ (again, here we treat the words as numbers and consider their numeric magnitudes).

Let us change variables in inequality (13): since φ is not surjective, we cannot hope to find a preimage for every argument $w' \in \Sigma^*$, but let us for the moment

assume that $w' \in \mathrm{Im}(\varphi)$, i.e., w' has a preimage $\varphi^{-1}(w')$ that is unique since φ is injective. By substitution, we get

$$\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(\varphi^{-1}(w')) \leq \mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(w'). \tag{14}$$

For such a $w' = \rho(M'_{\overline{SQ}})\$w\$0^*z$, where $w \in SQ$, it is a simple matter to extract the preimage w, located "somewhere in the middle" of w'. Precisely, w is located in the left-most k-bit block (among the total of λ such blocks), and has a length equal to $\frac{1}{\lambda}\,\mathrm{len}\,(w') - c'$, where the constant $c' \geq c$ accounts for the length of $\rho(M'_{\overline{SQ}})$, the separator symbols \$, and a possible remainder of zeroes from the 0^ν-trailer. Moreover, w can be assumed to have the form $w = 1(0 \cup 1)^{\mathrm{len}(w)-1}$, since the reduction φ can discard all leading zeroes from the "number" w for the decision by $M'_{\overline{SQ}}$ (one check that this machine does is testing its input for not being a square number[2]). In the following, remember that we use w to synonymously mean a string or the integer $(w)_2$.

The preimage $w \in \varphi^{-1}(w')$ numerically satisfies

$$w \geq 2^{\mathrm{len}(w)-1} = 2^{\frac{1}{\lambda}\left\lceil \log(w')_2 \right\rceil - c' - 1} \geq 2^{-c''}\sqrt[\lambda]{w'},$$

where c'' is a constant again.

Substituting this into (14), we get $\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(2^{-c''}\sqrt[\lambda]{w'}) \leq \mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(w')$. Using that $\mathrm{dens}_{SQ}(x) \in \Theta(\sqrt{x})$ (Lemma 3.2), we end up finding that for a constant D' (implied by the Θ), another constant β (dependent on c'') and sufficiently long w',

$$D'\sqrt{2^{-c''}\sqrt[\lambda]{w'}} = D \cdot \sqrt[\beta]{w'} \leq \mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(w'), \tag{15}$$

where D is yet another constant. Observe that the construction requires $\lambda \geq 3$ and therefore makes $\beta \geq 6$ (we will use this observation later).

Now, let us turn to the other case of w' *not* having a preimage under φ. The key insight here is that for lower-bounding the count (the density function), it suffices to identify *some* w that under φ maps to something smaller than w' in terms of Gödel numbers. A simple and reliable way to find such a value is to apply the previous extraction, and divide its output by 2, so that we effectively take away one bit from the middle block. Calling this result w again, it maps to $\varphi(w) = \rho(M_{\overline{SQ}})\$w\$0^\nu$, where w has been extracted from the given value $w' = (0 \cup 1)^* w (0 \cup 1)^*$, in which the prefix and suffix are dropped from $\varphi(w)$ upon the extraction). Since we shrunk w by one bit, we have $\mathrm{len}\,(\varphi(w)) < \mathrm{len}\,(w')$, and therefore the same inequality if we treat w' and $\varphi(w)$ as numeric quantities. This is not a preimage in the sense from before, but its choice assures that all values up to (the so obtained value) w map under φ to words with Gödel numbers less than $gn(w')$ (cf. Figure 3 to visually confirm that this procedure delivers a valid estimate). So, we may rewrite (15) into

$$D \cdot \sqrt[\beta]{w'/2} = d \cdot \sqrt[\beta]{w'} \leq \mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(w'), \tag{16}$$

[2]Recall that $M'_{\overline{SQ}}$ basically tests membership SQ and inverts the answer.

where $d = D/\sqrt[\beta]{2}$ is a constant again. In particular, notice that the bound has become looser compared to (15) (since the density function is monotone), and thus remains valid in both cases.

Remark 3.8. *Note that (some of) the constants involved in the lower bounds* (15) *and* (16) *actually and ultimately depend (through a chain of implications) on the choices of the two functions t and T. These give rise to the language L_D and determine the "stopwatch" that we must attach to the simulation of $M_{\overline{SQ}}$ when reducing the language SQ to our hard-to-decide language $L_D \in \text{DTIME}(T) \setminus \text{DTIME}(t)$. This in turn controls the overhead for the reduction function φ in Lemma 3.7 and the magnitude of the constants λ, β, etc.*

Combining (16) with Lemma 3.6, and after renaming the variables from w' to x, we can strengthen our previous results into stating:

Lemma 3.9. *Let t, T be as in Assumption 3.4 and assume $t(n) \geq n^3$. Then, there exists a language $L_0 \in \text{DTIME}(T) \setminus \text{DTIME}(t)$ together with an integer constant $\beta \geq 6$ and a real constant $d > 0$, and some $x_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ for which*

$$d \cdot \sqrt[\beta]{x} \leq dens_{L_0}(x) \leq \sqrt{x}$$

for all $x \geq x_0$.

3.5 Threshold Sampling

As the time to evaluate our sought OWF is limited to be polynomial, we cannot construct yes- and no-instances of $w \stackrel{?}{\in} L_0$ by directly testing a randomly chosen word w. Instead, we will sample a set of m such words in a way that probabilistically assures at least one of them to be in L_0 without having to check membership explicitly. That is, we will randomly draw elements from the family

$$\mathcal{L}_N = \{W \subset \Sigma^* : gn(W) \subseteq \{1, \ldots, N\} \wedge W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset\}\,, \tag{17}$$

where the role and definition of the size N will be discussed in detail below.

The hardness of this new language is inherited from L_0 as the following simple consideration shows:

Lemma 3.10. *Let L_0 be as in Lemma 3.9, let $N > 0$ and let $\mathcal{L}_N$ be defined by* (17)*. Then $\mathcal{L}_N \in \text{DTIME}(N \cdot T) \setminus \text{DTIME}(t)$. Here, the input arguments of t and T are the maximal bitlengths of the words in $W \in \mathcal{L}_N$.*

Proof. Take $w \in \{0,1\}^*$. If $\mathcal{L}_N \in \text{DTIME}(t)$, then we could take any fixed $w^* \in L_0$, and (in polynomial time) cast w into $W = \{w, w^*, w^*, \ldots, w^*\}$. Obviously, $w \in L_0 \iff W \in \mathcal{L}_N$, so $L_0 \in \text{DTIME}(t)$, which is a contradiction.

Conversely, $W = \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\} \in \mathcal{L}_N$ can be decided by checking $w_i \stackrel{?}{\in} L_0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \leq N$, which takes a total of $\leq N \cdot T$ time. So, $\mathcal{L}_N \in \text{DTIME}(N \cdot T)$. □

Let us keep N fixed for the moment and take $U \subset \Sigma^*$ as a finite set (urn) with N elements. Then, sampling from $\mathcal{L}_N$ amounts to drawing a subset $W \subseteq U \subset \Sigma^*$, hoping that the resulting set intersects L_0, i.e., $W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset$. To avoid deciding if $[\exists w \in W : w \in L_0]$, which would take $O(|W| \cdot T(\max_{w \in W} \mathrm{len}\,(w)))$ time, we use a probabilistic method from random graph theory.

The predicate $Q_k(W)$ for a k-element subset of words $W \subseteq U$ is defined as "true" if $W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset$ (that is, Q_N is yet another way of defining $\mathcal{L}_N$). In the following, let us slightly abuse our notation and write Q_k to also mean the *event* that $W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset$ for a randomly chosen $W \subseteq U$ of cardinality k. The likelihood for Q_k to occur under a uniform distribution is, with $|U| = N$,

$$\Pr(Q_k) = |\{W \subseteq U : |W| = k, W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset\}| \,/ \binom{N}{k}.$$

Hereafter, we omit the subscript and write only Q whenever we refer to the general property (not specifically for sets of given size).

Lemma 3.9 tells us that the element count of L_0 up to a number $0 < x < N$ is at least $d \cdot \sqrt[\beta]{x} > 0$ and $\leq \sqrt{x} < N$, when x and N are sufficiently large. This implies that Q_k is actually a *non-trivial* property of subsets of U (in the sense of describing neither the empty nor the full set). Moreover, it is a *monotone increasing* property, since once $Q_k(W)$ holds, then $Q_k(W')$ trivially holds for every superset $W' \supseteq W$. As it is known that all monotone properties have a threshold [2], we now go on looking for one explicitly, at which the following result helps:

Theorem 3.11 ([2, Thm.4])**.** *Let Q be a nontrivial and monotonously increasing property of subsets of a set U, where $|U| = N$.*

Let $m^*(N) = \max\{k : \Pr(Q_k) \leq 1/2\}$, and $\omega(N) \geq 1$.

1. *If $m \leq m^*/\omega(N)$, then*

$$\Pr(Q_m) \leq 1 - 2^{-1/\omega}, \tag{18}$$

2. *and if $m \geq \omega(N) \cdot (m^* + 1)$, then*

$$\Pr(Q_m) \geq 1 - 2^{-\omega} \tag{19}$$

The next steps are thus working out m^* explicitly, with the aid of Lemma 3.9. Our first task on this agenda is therefore estimating $\Pr(Q_k)$, so as to determine the function m^*.

Define $p = \mathrm{dens}_{L_0}(N)/N$ as the fraction of elements of L_0 among the entirety of N elements[3] (cf. Lemma 3.1) in $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, whose corresponding words in U are recovered by virtue of gn^{-1}. The total number of k-subsets from N elements is $\binom{N}{k}$, among which there are $\binom{(1-p)N}{k}$ elements that are *not* in

[3]The variable N will later be made dependent on the input length ℓ, so that p as defined here is actually $p(\ell)$ as announced in the abstract.

L_0 (note that $(1-p)N$ is an integer). Thus, the likelihood to draw a k-element subset that contains at least one element from L_0 is given by

$$\frac{\binom{N}{k} - \binom{(1-p)N}{k}}{\binom{N}{k}} = 1 - \frac{\binom{(1-p)N}{k}}{\binom{N}{k}} = \Pr(Q_k).$$

The threshold obviously depends on p (through the predicate/event Q_k that is determined by it), and is by Theorem 3.11

$$m^*(N,p) = \max\left\{k : \Pr(Q_k) \leq \frac{1}{2}\right\} = \max\left\{k : \frac{\binom{(1-p)N}{k}}{\binom{N}{k}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\right\}. \tag{20}$$

To simplify matters in the following, let us think of the factorial being evaluated as a Γ-function (omitted in the following to keep the formulas slightly simpler), so that all expressions *continuously* depend on the involved variables (whenever they are well-defined). This relaxation lets us work with the real value $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ (replacing the integer k for the moment) that satisfies the identity

$$\frac{\binom{(1-p)N}{\kappa}}{\binom{N}{\kappa}} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{(N-\kappa)!((1-p)N)!}{N!((1-p)N-\kappa)!} \tag{21}$$

instead of having to look for the (discrete) maximal $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\Pr(Q_k) \leq 1/2$. The sought integer solution to (20) is then (relying on the continuity) obtained by rounding κ towards an integer.

Since the expressions $((1-p)N)!$ and $N!$ in the nominator and denominator, respectively, do not depend on κ, let us expand the remaining quotient

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(N-\kappa)!}{((1-p)N-\kappa)!} &= \frac{(N-\kappa)!}{(N-\kappa-pN)!} \\ &= (N-\kappa-pN+1)(N-\kappa-pN+2)\cdots(N-\kappa-1)(N-\kappa),\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

which has exactly pN factors (notice that pN is indeed an integer, since this is just the element count on the condition $w \in L_0$ for $1 \leq gn(w) \leq N$).

Trivial upper and lower bounds on (22) are obtained by using pN-th powers of the largest or smallest term in the product. That is,

$$\frac{((1-p)N)!}{N!}((1-p)N-\kappa+1)^{pN} \leq \underbrace{\frac{(N-\kappa)!((1-p)N)!}{N!((1-p)N-\kappa)!}}_{=:r(\kappa)} \leq \frac{((1-p)N)!}{N!}(N-\kappa)^{pN}.$$

Equation (21) can be stated more generally as solving the equation $r(\kappa) = y$ for κ, given a right-hand side value y. The bounds on $r(\kappa)$ then imply bounds on the solutions of equation (21), which are

$$1 + N(1-p) - \left(\frac{y \cdot N!}{((1-p)N)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{pN}} \leq r^{-1}(y) \leq N - \left(\frac{y \cdot N!}{((1-p)N)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{pN}}.$$

By substituting $y = 1/2$ into the last expression, we obtain the sought bounds

$$\underbrace{\left\lfloor 1 + N(1-p) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{N!}{((1-p)N)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^N}} \right\rfloor}_{=\mu_*(N,p)} \leq k \leq \underbrace{\left\lceil N - \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{N!}{((1-p)N)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^N}} \right\rceil}_{=:\mu^*(N,p)}$$

The threshold $m^*(N,p)$ is defined as the maximal such $k \in \mathbb{N}$, but must respect the same upper and lower limits, where the rounding operations on the bounds ($\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ and $\lceil\cdot\rceil$) preserve the validity of the limits when κ is rounded towards an integer. Thus, the bound is now

$$\mu_*(N,p) \leq m^*(N,p) \leq \mu^*(N,p), \tag{23}$$

with functions μ_*, μ^* induced by the language L_0 through the parameter p.

Our next step is using the bounds obtained on the fraction p of elements in L_0 that fall into the discrete interval $[1,N] = U \subset \mathbb{N}$ to refine the above bounds on the threshold m^*. First, we use Lemma 3.9 to bound p as

$$p_* := d \cdot \frac{\sqrt[\beta]{N}}{N} \leq p \leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{N} =: p^* \tag{24}$$

for sufficiently large N. Furthermore, observe that the threshold $m^*(N,p)$ is monotonously decreasing in p, since the more "good" elements (those from L_0) we have in the set of N, the less elements do we need to draw until we come across a "good" one. Thus, for $p_* \leq p \leq p^*$, we have

$$m^*(N,p^*) \leq m^*(N,p) \leq m^*(N,p_*). \tag{25}$$

With this, we define the number $m(N)$ of elements that we draw at random from $\mathcal{L}_N$ as

$$m = m(N) := \frac{1}{\sqrt[\alpha]{N}} \mu_*(N,p^*), \tag{26}$$

for a constant $\alpha > 1$ that we will determine later.

Note that μ_* may in some cases take on negative values, but it is nonetheless an asymptotic nontrivial (i.e., positive and increasing) lower bound. To see this, let us expand the product $N!/((1-p)N)!$ occurring in the definition of $\mu_*(N,p)$. Take $p = p^* = 1/\sqrt{N}$ in

$$\frac{N!}{((1-p^*)N)!} = \prod_{j=0}^{p^* \cdot N - 1} (N-j),$$

and raise both sides to the $\frac{1}{p^* N}$-th power, to reveal that each factor satisfies $1 \leq (N-j)^{1/(p^* N)} \leq N^{1/\sqrt{N}} \to 1$. Likewise, $\sqrt[p^* N]{1/2} \to 1$ for $N \to \infty$, so that $\mu_*(N,p^*) \in \Theta(N(1-p^*)) = \Theta(N - \sqrt{N})$, and we get

$$m(N) \in \Theta(N^{1-1/\alpha}), \tag{27}$$

where $\alpha > 1$ induces a growth towards $+\infty$.

Regardless of whether we wish to draw some $W \in \mathcal{L}_N$ or $W \notin \mathcal{L}_N$, our sampling algorithm will in any case output a set W of cardinality m. The difference between an output $W \in \mathcal{L}_N$ or $W \notin \mathcal{L}_N$ is being made on the number N of elements from which we draw W.

The key step towards sampling $W \notin \mathcal{L}_N$ is therefore to thin out U by dropping elements at random, until the cardinality $N = |U|$ is so small that $m(|U'|, p)$ *exceeds* the threshold m^* (that applies to the now smaller urn U). Otherwise, we choose U so large that m *undercuts* the threshold m^* that applies to the full set U.

Specifically, we need to suitably thin out U to U' so that pulling out the *same* number of m elements either makes (18) or (19) from Theorem 3.11 apply. In the following, let the smaller set U' have n entries, and let the larger set U have $N = n^{2\beta}$ entries[4], where β is the constant from Lemma 3.9.

Remark 3.12. *Observe that the threshold function $m^*(N, p)$ that applies to sampling from a set U with N elements must always satisfy $m^*(N, p) \leq N = |U|$. By choosing $|U| \leq n^{2\beta}$, we assure that the threshold m^* (and hence also the selection count m) is polynomial in n.*

To sample...

- ...a no-instance $W \notin \mathcal{L}_N$, we use a set $|U| = N = n^{2\beta}$ elements. Let us write $p = |U \cap L_0| / |U|$ for the likelihood to hit an element from L_0 within U, then we actually undercut the threshold by drawing

$$m = \frac{1}{\sqrt[\alpha]{N}} \mu_*(N, p^*) \leq \mu_*(N, p^*) \overset{(23)}{\leq} m^*(N, p^*),$$

  elements (note that $N^{-1/\alpha} < 1$ for $N > 1$). This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{m^*(N,p)}{m} \overset{(25)}{\geq} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{m^*(N,p^*)}{m} \overset{(23)}{\geq} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\mu_*(N,p^*)}{m} \\ = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sqrt[\alpha]{N} = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

  so $m(N)$ asymptotically stays under the threshold m^*.

- ...a yes-instance $W \in \mathcal{L}_N$, we cut down the cardinality by a factor of $s = n^{2\beta-1}$, i.e., we drop elements from U until only $|U'| = |U|/s = n^{2\beta}/s = n$ entries remain. Like before, let us write $p' = |U' \cap L_0| / |U'|$ for the likelihood to draw a member of L_0 from $U' \subset U$, and keep in mind that the threshold m^* is designed for the smaller urn with only N/s entries, from which we nonetheless draw m elements.

  Intuitively, observe that the *relative* amount p' of elements from L_0 within U' remains unchanged (in the limit) upon the drop-out process, provided

[4]The choice of 2β is arbitrary and for convenience, to ease the algebra and to let the expressions nicely simplify.

that the deletion disregards the specific structure of a word w (which is trivial to implement).

Formally, we have $p = \Pr(w \in L_0 | w \in U)$, and $p' = \Pr(w \in L_0 | w \in U')$. The latter is

$$\begin{aligned} p' &= \frac{\Pr(w \in L_0 \wedge w \in U')}{\Pr(w \in U')} = \frac{\Pr(w \in L_0 \wedge (w \text{ is selected}) \wedge w \in U)}{\Pr((w \text{ is selected}) \wedge w \in U)} \\ &= \frac{\Pr(w \in L_0 \wedge w \in U)\Pr(w \text{ is selected})}{\Pr(w \in U)\Pr(w \text{ is selected})} = \Pr(w \in L_0 | w \in U) = p, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from the selection of w into U' being stochastically independent of the other events. Later, this is achieved by specifying Algorithm 2 (function SELECT) to *not* care about how w looks like or relates to any language.

So, there is no need to distinguish the parameter p for U and U' and we can consider

$$0 \overset{(27)}{\leq} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{m^*(N/s,p)}{m} \overset{(25)}{\leq} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{m^*(N/s,p_*)}{m} \overset{(23)}{\leq} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sqrt[\alpha]{N}\cdot\mu^*(N/s,p_*)}{\mu_*(N,p^*)}.$$

We substitute $N = n^{2\beta}, s = n^{2\beta-1}$ and the bounds (24), rearrange terms, and cast the factorials into Γ-functions, which turns the last quotient into (dropping the $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ and $\lceil\cdot\rceil$ to ease matters w.l.o.g.),

$$\frac{\left(n^{2\beta}\right)^{1/\alpha}\left(1+n-\overbrace{2^{-\frac{n^{2\beta-3}}{d}}\left(\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\Gamma\left(n-dn^{3-2\beta}+1\right)}\right)^{\frac{n^{2\beta-3}}{d}}}^{=:A}\right)}{1+\underbrace{n^{\beta}\left(n^{\beta}-1\right)}_{=:B}-\underbrace{2^{-n^{-\beta}}\left(\frac{\Gamma\left(n^{2\beta}+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(n^{2\beta}-n^{\beta}+1\right)}\right)^{n^{-\beta}}}_{=:C}} \tag{28}$$

where $d > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ are the constant appearing in Lemma 3.9. Towards showing that (28) $\in O(n^{-\gamma})$ for some constant $\gamma > 0$, it is useful to consider the nominator and denominator of (28) separately, as well as the terms A, B and C therein.

Nominator of (28): Towards showing that term A is bounded, let us first raise the whole expression to the constant d, which removes this variable and leaves the claim regarding boundedness unchanged. Then, within term A, consider the quotient

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\Gamma\left(n-dn^{3-2\beta}+1\right)} &= \frac{\Gamma(n+1)/n!}{\Gamma\left(n-dn^{3-2\beta}+1\right)/n!} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(n+1-n)}{\Gamma(n-dn^{3-2\beta}+1-n)} = \frac{\Gamma(1)}{\Gamma(1-dn^{3-2\beta})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second identity follows by repeated application of the relation $z\Gamma(z) = \Gamma(z+1)$.

Above, we noted that $\beta \geq 6$, so $3 - 2\beta < 0$ and therefore $d \cdot n^{3-2\beta} \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$. Since Γ is continuous on the (strictly) positive real line, the quotient approaches 1 as $n \to \infty$. Thus, writing out term A and letting $n \to \infty$,

$$\underbrace{2^{-n^{2\beta-3}}}_{\to 0} \underbrace{\left(\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\Gamma\left(n - dn^{3-2\beta} + 1\right)}\right)^{n^{2\beta-3}}}_{<2 \text{ as } n\to\infty} \to 0.$$

Thus, for some constant E, we have the nominator of (28) asymptotically bounded as $\leq n^{2\beta/\alpha}(n+E) \in O(n^{2\beta/\alpha+1})$.

Denominator of (28): Term C is,

$$2^{-n^{-\beta}} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(n^{2\beta}+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(n^{2\beta} - n^{\beta} + 1\right)}\right)^{n^{-\beta}} \tag{29}$$

in which $2^{-n^{-\beta}} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Since β, n are both integers, the quotient of Γ-functions expands into

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(n^{2\beta}+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(n^{2\beta} - n^{\beta} + 1\right)} = \frac{(n^{2\beta})!}{(n^{2\beta} - n^{\beta})!} = \prod_{j=0}^{n^{\beta}-1} (n^{2\beta} - j). \tag{30}$$

Raising both sides to $n^{-\beta}$, each factor on the right of (30) satisfies $1 \leq (n^{2\beta} - j)^{1/n^{\beta}} \leq n^{2\beta/n^{\beta}} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, (29) approaches 1 as $n \to \infty$. The denominator of (28) is therefore dominated by term B, and asymptotically grows as $(n^{2\beta} - n^{\beta}) \in \Omega(n^{\beta/2})$, where the lower-bound is intentionally chosen crude here only for technical convenience.

Combining the asymptotic bounds on the nominator and denominator, we end up asserting

$$(28) \in O(n^{2\beta/\alpha+1} \cdot n^{-\beta/2})$$

It is easily discovered that $1 + 2\beta/\alpha - \beta/2 < 0$, if $\beta > 2$ (previously, we noted that $\beta \geq 6$) and $\alpha > 4\beta/(\beta-2)$. Thus, we are free to put $\alpha := 4\beta/(\beta-2) + 2\beta$ in (26) (note that $\alpha > 1$ since $\beta > 2$), to achieve

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{m^*(N/s, p)}{m(N)} \in O(n^{-\gamma}), \tag{31}$$

where $\gamma = (\beta-2)^2/(2\beta)$. Thus, m grows faster than the threshold m^* in this case.

Now, let us use (18) and (19) to work out the likelihoods of sampling an element from $\mathcal{L}_N$ or $\overline{\mathcal{L}_N}$, which is the set of sample sets that do (not) contain a word from L_0. In the following, let us write $m(N)$ in omission of the unknown

parameter p, since this one is replaced by its upper approximation p^* that depends on N (through (24)).

Let $\omega(N) \geq 1$ (according to Theorem 3.11).

1. Case 1 of Theorem 3.11 applies if $m(N) \leq m^*(N,p)/\omega(N)$. This is equivalent to $\omega(N) \leq m^*(N,p)/m(N)$, so that

$$\frac{m^*(N,p)}{m(N)} \overset{(25)}{\geq} \frac{m^*(N,p^*)}{m(N)} \overset{(23)}{\geq} \frac{\mu_*(N,p^*)}{m(N)} = \frac{\mu_*(N,p^*)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt[\alpha]{N}}\mu_*(N,p^*)} = \sqrt[\alpha]{N},$$

   so that we can take $\omega(N) = \sqrt[\alpha]{N} \geq 1$ (as required).

   The likelihood to sample an element from $\mathcal{L}_N$ thus asymptotically satisfies

$$\Pr(Q_m) = \Pr(w \in \mathcal{L}_N) \leq 1 - 2^{-1/\omega} = 1 - 2^{-1/\sqrt[\alpha]{N}} \to 0. \tag{32}$$

2. Case 2 of Theorem 3.11 applies if $m(N) \geq \omega(N) \cdot (m^*(N)+1)$. From (31), we have $m^*(n,p)/m(N) \in O(n^{-\gamma})$, where $N = n^{2\beta}$. This, and the previously established growth of $m(N) \to \infty$ by (27), reveals that when N (and hence also n) becomes large enough,

$$\frac{m^*(n,p)+1}{m(N)} = \frac{m^*(n,p)}{m(N)} + \frac{1}{m(N)} \leq F \cdot n^{-\gamma} + \frac{1}{m(N)},$$

   for a constant $F > 0$ implied by the $O(n^{-\gamma})$. Thus,

$$(m^*(n,p)+1)\frac{1}{F \cdot n^{-\gamma} + \frac{1}{m(N)}} \leq m(N),$$

   and so we can take

$$\omega(n) = \frac{1}{F \cdot n^{-\gamma} + \frac{1}{m(N)}} = \frac{n^\gamma}{F + \frac{n^\gamma}{m(N)}},$$

   after rearranging terms. To analyze the growth of ω, we substitute the values for $\gamma = (\beta-2)^2/(2\beta)$ and $\alpha = 4\beta/(\beta-2)+2\beta$ and use (27) for the asymptotic bound $m(N) \geq G \cdot N^{1-1/\alpha} = G \cdot n^{2\beta-2\beta/\alpha}$ for some constant $G > 0$. After some algebra, we discover

$$\omega(n) \geq \frac{n^{\frac{(\beta-2)^2}{2\beta}}}{G \cdot \underbrace{n^{-1-\frac{3}{2}\beta}}_{\to 0 \text{ since } \beta > 0} + F} \in \Omega(n^\gamma).$$

   Therefore, by Theorem 3.11, the likelihood to sample from $\mathcal{L}_N$ asymptotically satisfies

$$\Pr(Q_m) = \Pr(w \in \mathcal{L}_N) \geq 1 - 2^{-\omega(n)} \geq 1 - 2^{-\Omega(n^\gamma)} \to 1. \tag{33}$$

Algorithm 1 Threshold Sampling

Input: an input bit $b \in \{0,1\}$ and an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Output: Output of a random finite set $W \subset \Sigma^*$ whose cardinality is polynomial in n, and which either satisfies $W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset$ or $W \cap L_0 = \emptyset$, with high probability, depending on whether $b = 1$ or $b = 0$ was supplied.

1: **function** THRESHOLD-SAMPLING(b, n)
2: $m \leftarrow n^{-2\beta/\alpha} \cdot \mu_*(n^{2\beta}, n^{-\beta})$ ▷ subst. $N = n^{2\beta}$ in eqs. (24), (26)
3: **if** $b = 1$ **then** ▷ for $b = 1$, exceed the threshold m^*
4: choose $U \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n^{2\beta}\}$ with $|U| = n$ ▷ i.i.d. uniform
5: **else** ▷ for $b = 0$, undercut the threshold m^*
6: $U \leftarrow \{1, 2, \ldots, n^{2\beta}\}$
7: **end if**
8: select $W \subseteq U$ with $|W| = m$ ▷ i.i.d. uniform
9: **return** W
10: **end function**

At this point, let us briefly resume our sampling method as Algorithm 1. The constants α and β will appearing therein depend on the language L_0. Its correctness is established by Lemma 3.13 as our next intermediate cleanup.

Lemma 3.13. *Algorithm 1 runs in polynomial time in n (assuming an effort of $O(1)$ for the random selection in lines 4 and 8) and outputs a set W of cardinality that is polynomial in n, which satisfies:*

- $\Pr(W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset | b = 1) \geq 1 - 2^{-\Omega(n^\gamma)}$, *and*
- $\Pr(W \cap L_0 = \emptyset | b = 0) \geq 2^{-n^{-2\beta/\alpha}}$,

where the (positive) constants α, β and γ depend on the language L_0.

Proof. The events $W \cap L_0 = \emptyset$ or $W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset$ correspond to the previously predicate/event Q_m and its negation. Thus, the asserted likelihoods follow from (33) and (32), obviously conditional on the input bit b.

The time-complexity of Algorithm 1 is polynomial in n, since we draw no more than $n^{2\beta}$ elements, each of which has $\leq \lceil \log(n^{2\beta}) \rceil$ bits, where β is a constant determined by L_0. □

Remark 3.14. *It may be tempting to think of threshold sampling to be conceptually flawed here, if the experiment is misleadingly interpreted in the following sense: assume that we would draw a constant number of balls from two urns, one with few balls in them, the other containing many balls, but with the fraction of "good ones" being the same in both urns. Then, the likelihood to draw at least one "good ball" should intuitively be the same upon an equal number of trials. However, it must be stressed that the number of balls in the larger urn grows asymptotically different (and faster) than the ball count in the smaller urn. Thus, sticking with a fixed number of trials in both urns, the* absolute *number of balls that we draw from either urn is indeed identical, but the* fraction *(relative number) of balls is eventually different in the long run.*

3.6 Counting the Random Coins in Algorithm 1

Since Algorithm 1 relies on i.i.d. uniform sampling of m elements from the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n^{2\beta}\}$ or a subset thereof, we need to know how well a bunch of k random bits can approximate such a choice, given that m is not necessarily a power of two. For the time being, let us call $\omega \in \{0,1\}^*$ an auxiliary lot of random coins that is (implicitly) available to Algorithm 1. Our goal is proving $\mathrm{len}\,(\omega) \in \mathrm{poly}(n)$ to verify that the selection is doable by a probabilistic polynomial-time algorithm, to which we can add ω as another input.

Specifically, the problem is to choose a random subset (of size n in line 4 or size m in line 8 of Algorithm 1) from a given total of N elements in U. In the following, let us write m for the size of the selected subset. Furthermore, assume U to be canonically ordered (as a subset of $\mathbb{N}$).

We do the selection by randomly permuting a vector of indicator variables, defined with m 1's followed by $N-m$ zeroes (i.e., permute the bits of the word $1^m 0^{N-m}$). The selected subset $W \subset U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_N\}$ is retrieved from the permuted output $(b_1, \ldots, b_N) \in \{0,1\}^N$ by including $u_i \in W \iff b_i = 1$. This procedure is indeed correct for our purposes, since every m-element subset $W \subseteq U$ corresponds to a word $w' = \{0,1\}^N$, where w' contains exactly m 1-bits at the positions of elements that were selected into W. The representative word w' can thus be obtained by permuting the word $w = 1^m 0^{N-m}$, and we count the number of permutations π that yield $w' = \pi(w)$. There are $N!$ permutations in total. For any fixed permutation π, swapping the 1's within their fixed positions leaves π unchanged, so the number $N!$ reduces by a factor of $m!$ for m 1-bits. Likewise, permuting the $(N-m)$ zero-bits only has no effect, so another $(N-m)!$ cases are divided out. If our choice of π is uniform, the chance to draw any m-element subset by this permutation approach is therefore given by $(m!(N-m)!)/N! = 1/\binom{N}{m}$, which matches our assumption for the threshold functions in Section 3.5.

Thus, the random selection of an m-element subset boils down to a matter of producing a random permutation of $N = |U|$ elements. We use a Fisher-Yates shuffle to do this, which requires a method to uniformly select an integer i in a prescribed range $i_{\min} \le i \le i_{\max}$.

The necessary random integers are obtained by virtue of the auxiliary string ω. For a single integer, let us take k bits $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k \in \{0,1\}$ from ω, where the exact count will be specified later. These k bits define a real-valued random quantity r by setting $r := (0.b_1 b_2 b_3 \ldots b_k)_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i \cdot 2^{-i} \in [0,1)$. Note that r actually ranges within the discrete set $R = \{j \cdot 2^{-k} : j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, 2^k - 1\}$. To convert r into a random integer in the desired range $\{i_{\min}, i_{\min}+1, \ldots, i_{\max}\}$, we divide the interval $[0,1)$ into $i_{\max} - i_{\min} + 1$ equally spaced intervals of width $h = 1/(i_{\max} - i_{\min} + 1)$, and output the index of the sub-interval that covers r (the process is very similar to the well-known inversion method to sample from a given discrete probability distribution). This method only works correctly if r is a continuously distributed random quantity within $[0,1)$, and is biased when r has a finite mantissa (i.e., is a rational value). So, our first step will be comparing the "ideal" to the "real" setting.

If the sampling were "ideal", then r would be continuously and uniformly ($c.u.$) distributed over $[0,1)$. With h being the spacing of $[0,1)$, the method outputs the index i_0 with likelihood

$$\Pr_{c.u.}(i_0) = \int_{i_0 \cdot h}^{(i_0+1)\cdot h} 1 dt = h.$$

Next, we consider the event of outputting i_0 considering that r is discrete and uniformly ($d.u.$) distributed over R, with the probabilities $\Pr_{d.u.}(r = j \cdot 2^{-k}) = 2^{-k}$. The output index is i_0 if $r \in [i_0 \cdot h, (i_0+1)\cdot h)$. This interval covers all indices j satisfying $j \cdot 2^{-k} \geq i_0 \cdot h$ and $j \cdot 2^{-k} < (i_0+1)\cdot h$, i.e., all of which lead to the same output i_0. Since each possible r occurs with the same likelihood 2^{-k}, we get

$$\Pr_{d.u.}(i_0) = q = \sum_{j=\lceil 2^k i_0 h \rceil}^{\lceil 2^k (i_0+1) h \rceil - 1} 2^{-k} = 2^{-k} \underbrace{\left(\lceil 2^k \cdot (i_0+1) \cdot h \rceil - \lceil 2^k i_0 h \rceil \right)}_{=:D}$$

Consider the approximation $\tilde{q} = 2^{-k}\tilde{D}$, where $\tilde{D} := 2^k \cdot (i_0+1) \cdot h - 2^k i_0 h$. Obviously, $|D - \tilde{D}| \leq 2$, so that $|q - \tilde{q}| \leq 2 \cdot 2^{-k} = 2^{-k+1}$, and therefore, since $\tilde{q} = h = \Pr_{c.u.}(i_0)$,

$$\left| \Pr_{d.u.}(i_0) - \Pr_{c.u.}(i_0) \right| = \left| \Pr_{d.u.}(i_0) - h \right| \leq 2^{-k+1}, \tag{34}$$

where i_0 is an arbitrary integer in the prescribed range $\{i_{\min}, i_{\min}+1, \ldots, i_{\max}\}$, and k is the number of bits in the value $r = 0.b_1 b_2 \ldots b_k$, which determines the output i_0 as $i_0 \leftarrow \lfloor r/h \rfloor$ for $h = 1/(i_{\max} - i_{\min} + 1)$.

For the complexity of this procedure, note that all these operations are doable in polynomial time in $k, \log(i_{\min})$ and $\log(i_{\max})$. Let us now turn back to the problem of producing a "almost uniform" random permutation by the Fisher-Yates algorithm. In essence, the sought permutation is created by choosing the first element $\pi(1)$ from the full set of N elements, then retracting $\pi(1)$ from U, and choosing the second element from the remaining $N-1$ elements, and so forth.

If we denote the so-obtained sequence of integers as $i_N, i_{N-1}, \ldots, i_1$, a uniform choice of the permutation means to draw any possible such sequence with likelihood

$$\Pr_{\text{unif}}(i_N, i_{N-1}, \ldots, i_1) = \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{N-j}, \tag{35}$$

since the bits taken from ω to define r are stochastically independent in each round.

Our current task is thus comparing this likelihood to the probability of drawing the same sequence under random choices made upon repeatedly taking chunks of k bits from the auxiliary input ω. As a reminder of this, let us replace the measure $\Pr_{d.u.}$ by $\Pr_{\omega}$ in the following, and keep in mind that the two are the same (based on the procedure described before).

Note that the output in the j-th step is the integer i_j that satisfies $|\Pr_\omega(i_j) - h_j| < 2^{-k+1}$, where h_j is the spacing of the interval (determined by the size of the urn from which we draw; in the j-th step, we have $h_j = 1/(N-j)$).

Since the construction of every i_{j+1} is determined by a fresh and stochastically independent lot of k bits from ω, we have

$$\Pr_\omega(i_N, i_{N-1}, \ldots, i_1) = \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \Pr_\omega(i_{j+1}). \tag{36}$$

Next, we shall pin down the number k, which determines how accurate (36) approximates (35). Fix $k = N^2 + 2$, so that (asymptotically in N and hence k) for $0 \le j < N$,

$$2^{-k+1} < 2^{-N^2} < 2^{-N} \frac{1}{N} < 2^{-N} \cdot \frac{1}{N-j}.$$

Combining this with (34) and recalling that $h = 1/(N-j)$, we can bound every term in (36) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_\omega(i_j) &\in \left(\frac{1}{N-j} - 2^{-N} \cdot \frac{1}{N-j}, \frac{1}{N-j} + 2^{-N} \cdot \frac{1}{N-j} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{N-j} \cdot \left[1 - 2^{-N}\right], \frac{1}{N-j} \cdot \left[1 + 2^{-N}\right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, this gives a nontrivial lower bound[5] to (36),

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_\omega(i_N, i_{N-1}, \ldots, i_1) &\ge \left(1 - 2^{-N}\right)^N \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{N-j} \\ &= \left(1 - 2^{-N}\right)^N \cdot \Pr_{\text{unif}}(i_N, i_{N-1}, \ldots, i_1). \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

The important part herein was the setting of $k = N^2 + 2$ to draw a single integer. Our goal was the selection of a set of $m(N) \le N$ out of N elements, and we need N integers to get the entire permutation of $\{1, 2, \ldots N\}$. So, the total lot of necessary i.i.d. random coins in ω is $N \cdot k \le N \cdot (N^2 + 2) \in O(N^3)$. Since, $N \le n^{2\beta}$ in every case (see Algorithm 1), we have $\text{len}(\omega) \le \text{poly}(n)$ as claimed.

For another intermediate cleanup, let us compile our findings into the probabilistic selection Algorithm 2 (that is actually a deterministic procedure with an auxiliary lot ω of random coins). Note that our specification of the algorithm returns the (potentially empty) remainder of unused bits in ω. This will turn out necessary over several invocations of the selection algorithm during the threshold sampling, to avoid re-using randomness there.

To finally specify Algorithm 1 with the auxiliary input ω, we simply need to replace the truly random and uniform selection of subsets in Algorithm 1 (lines

[5] indeed, also an upper bound, but this is not needed here.

Algorithm 2 Uniformly Random Selection

Input: a set $U = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N\}$ of cardinality N, and a string ω consisting of $\geq N^3 + 2N$ i.i.d. uniform random bits.

Output: a uniformly random subset $W \subseteq U$ of cardinality m for which (37) holds, and the rest of the random bits in ω (that have not been used).

function SELECT(m, U, ω)
  $W \leftarrow \emptyset; N \leftarrow |U|$
  $k \leftarrow N^2 + 2$
  for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$ **do** ▷ construct the permutation
    $r \leftarrow (0.b_1 b_2 \ldots b_k)_2$ ▷ $\omega = b_1 b_2 \ldots b_k b_{k+1} b_{k+2} \ldots$
    $\omega \leftarrow b_{k+1} b_{k+2} \ldots$ ▷ delete used bits from ω
    $h \leftarrow 1/(N-j)$
    define $\pi(j) := \lfloor r/h \rfloor$
  end for
  $w' \leftarrow \pi(1^m 0^{N-m})$ ▷ $w' = b_1 b_2 \ldots b_N$
  for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, put $u_i \in W \iff b_i = 1$
  return (W, ω)
end function

4 and 8) by our described selection procedure based on random coins from ω, which is algorithm SELECT. For convenience of the reader, the result is given as Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Probabilistic Threshold Sampling

Input: a bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$, an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and a word $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathrm{poly}(n)}$.

Output: a random finite set $W \subset \Sigma^*$ whose cardinality is polynomial in n, and rest of the bits in ω that have not been used.

function PTSAMP(b, n, ω)
  $m \leftarrow n^{-2\beta/\alpha} \cdot \mu_*(n^{2\beta}, n^{-\beta})$ ▷ subst. $N = n^{2\beta}$ in eqs. (24), (26)
  if $b = 1$ **then** ▷ exceed the threshold m^*
    $(U, \omega) \leftarrow$ SELECT$(n, \{1, 2, \ldots, n^{2\beta}\}, \omega)$ ▷ restrict U
  else ▷ for $b = 0$, undercut the threshold m^*
    $U \leftarrow \{1, 2, \ldots, n^{2\beta}\}$ ▷ use all of U
  end if
  $(W, \omega) \leftarrow$ SELECT(m, U, ω) ▷ choose m elements
  return (W, ω)
end function

To lift Lemma 3.13 to the new setting of Algorithm 3, let us apply (37) to the likelihood of the events Q_m and $\neg Q_m$, which mean "hitting an element from $\mathcal{L}_N$ within a selection of m elements", or not, respectively.

Specifically, we are interested in the likelihoods $\Pr_\omega(Q_m)$ and $\Pr_\omega(\neg Q_m)$, which under "idealized" sampling are bounded from below by (32) and (33), but are now to be computed under the sampling using the auxiliary string ω.

For the general event $Q \in \{Q_m, \neg Q_m\}$, let us write the likelihood $\Pr_\omega(Q)$ as a sum over all its (disjoint) atoms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_\omega(Q) &= \sum_{A\in Q} \Pr_\omega(A) \overset{(37)}{\geq} \sum_{A\in Q} \left(1-2^{-N}\right)^N \Pr_{\text{unif}}(A) \\ &= \left(1-2^{-N}\right)^N \sum_{A\in Q} \Pr_{\text{unif}}(A) = \left(1-2^{-N}\right)^N \cdot \Pr_{\text{unif}}(Q).\end{aligned}$$

So, we can re-state Lemma 3.13 in its new version, using (37):

Lemma 3.15. *Algorithm 3 runs in polynomial time in n (including the polynomial effort to draw uniformly random subsets) and outputs a set W of cardinality polynomial in n, which satisfies:*

$$\Pr(W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset | b = 1) \geq (1-2^{-n^{2\beta}})^{n^{2\beta}} \cdot (1-2^{-\Omega(n^\gamma)}) \tag{38}$$

$$\Pr(W \cap L_0 = \emptyset | b = 0) \geq (1-2^{-n^{2\beta}})^{n^{2\beta}} \cdot 2^{-n^{-2\beta/\alpha}}, \tag{39}$$

where the (positive) constants α, β and γ depending on the language L_0.

Remark 3.16. *It is of central importance to note that our proof is based on random draws of sets that provably contain the sought element with a probabilistic assurance but without an explicit certificate. In other words, although the sampling guarantees high chances of the right elements being selected and despite that we know what we are looking for, we cannot efficiently single out any particular output elements, which was the hit.*

3.7 Partial Bijectivity

By Definition 1.1, we can consider the input string $w = b_1 b_2 \dots b_\ell \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ to our (to be defined) OWF as a bunch of i.i.d. uniformly random bits, which we can split into a prefix word $v = b_1 \dots b_n$ of length $\text{len}(v) = n$ and a postfix $\omega = b_{n+1} \dots b_\ell$ so that $\text{len}(\omega) \geq N^3 + 2N$ (as Algorithm 2 requires), with $N = n^{2\beta}$. For sufficiently large ℓ, this division yields nonempty strings v and ω, when n is set to $n(\ell) := \max\left\{i \in \mathbb{N} : i^{6\beta} + 2i^{2\beta} + i \leq \ell\right\}$, i.e., the largest length n for which the remainder ω is sufficient to do the probabilistic sampling under Algorithm 3. It is easy to see that $n(\ell) \to \infty$ as $\ell \to \infty$, and the time-complexity to compute $n(\ell)$ is $\text{poly}(\ell)$.

Following (4), our OWF f_ℓ will then be defined on w as a bitwise mapping of the prefix v under the probabilistic threshold sampling Algorithm 3, which "encodes" the 1/0-bits of v as yes/no-instances of the decision problem $\mathcal{L}_N$. Formally, this is:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ \quad (W_i, \omega) \leftarrow \text{PTSAMP}(b_i, n, \omega) \\ f_\ell(w) = f_\ell(b_1 \dots b_n b_{n+1} \dots b_\ell) := (W_1, \dots, W_n).\end{array}\right\} \tag{40}$$

Our objective in the following is *partial bijectivity* of that mapping, in the sense of assuring that the first bit of the unknown input prefix w to f_ℓ can uniquely be computed from the image $f_\ell(w)$, even though f_ℓ may not be bijective. This invertibility will of course depend on the parameter ℓ, which determines the value n and through it controls the likelihood for a sampling error (as quantified by Lemma 3.15). If this likelihood is "sufficiently small" in the sense that the next Lemma 3.17 makes rigorous, then f_ℓ is indeed invertible on its first input bit.

Lemma 3.17. *Let X, Y be finite sets of equal cardinality and let $f : X \to Y$ be a deterministic function, where $\Pr(f(x) = f(x')) \leq p$ for any distinct $x, x' \in X$ drawn independently uniform at random. If $p < \frac{2}{|X|^2 - |X|}$, then f is bijective.*

Proof. It suffices to show injectivity of f, since the finiteness of X and Y together with $|X| = |Y|$ and injectivity of f implies surjectivity and hence invertibility of f. Towards the contradiction, assume that two values $x \neq x'$ exist that map onto $z = f(x) = f(y)$, i.e., f is not injective. Call p the probability for this to happen, taken over all pairs $(x, x') \in X \times X$ (the probability can be taken as relative frequency; the counting works since f is deterministic). This means that $p = \Pr(f(x) = f(x')) \geq 1/\binom{|X|}{2}$, which contradicts our hypothesis. □

Towards applying Lemma 3.17, we will focus on the first coordinate function

$$f_{\ell,1}(b_1) = \text{PTSAMP}(b_1, n, \omega),$$

with inputs as specified above (see (40)).

Since the input to $f_{\ell,1}$ is a pair $(b_1, \omega) \in \{0,1\} \times \{0,1\}^* = X$, we can partition the pre-image space X, based on the first input bit, into the two-element family $\mathcal{X}_\ell = \{[0], [1]\}$ with $[b] := \left\{ b\omega : \omega \in \{0,1\}^{\ell-1} \right\}$ for $b = 0, 1$. In this view, we can think of $f_{\ell,1}$ acting *deterministically* on $\mathcal{X}$, since the randomness ω used in Algorithm 3 is supplied with the input, but the equivalence class is the same for all possible ω. For the sake of having $f_{\ell,1}$ map into a two-element image set, we will partition the output set $\mathcal{Z}_m = \{W = \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\} : w_i \in \Sigma^* \, \forall i\} = f_{\ell,1}(\Sigma^\ell)$ with $m = m(N)$ in a similar manner as $\mathcal{Y}_\ell = \left\{ \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}, \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)} \right\}$ with $\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)} := f_{\ell,1}([0])$ and $\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)} = f_{\ell,1}([1])$ for $[0], [1] \in \mathcal{X}_\ell$. Then, $f_{\ell,1} : \mathcal{X}_\ell \to \mathcal{Y}_\ell$, with $|\mathcal{X}_\ell| = |\mathcal{Y}_\ell| = 2$ for every ℓ.

Take $x = 0\omega \neq x' = 1\omega'$ as random representatives of $[0]$ and $[1]$. The likelihood of the coincidence $f_{\ell,1}(x) = f_{\ell,1}(x')$ is then determined by the random coins ω, ω' in x and x', which directly go into Algorithm 3. The partition induces an equivalence relation $\sim$ on the image set of $f_{\ell,1}$, by an appeal to which we

can formulate the criterion of Lemma 3.17,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_{\omega,\omega'}(f_{\ell,1}([0]) \sim f_{\ell,1}([1])) &= \Pr_{\omega,\omega'}\left(\begin{matrix}\left[f_{\ell,1}([0])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}\wedge f_{\ell,1}([1])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}\right]\\ \vee\left[f_{\ell,1}([0])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)}\wedge f_{\ell,1}([1])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)}\right]\end{matrix}\right)\\ &\leq \Pr_{\omega,\omega'}\left(f_{\ell,1}([0])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}\wedge f_{\ell,1}([1])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}\right)\\ &\quad+\Pr_{\omega,\omega'}\left(f_{\ell,1}([0])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)}\wedge f_{\ell,1}([1])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)}\right)\\ &\leq \Pr_{\omega}\left(f_{\ell,1}([0])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)}\right)+\Pr_{\omega'}\left(f_{\ell,1}([1])\in\mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{41}$$

where the first inequality is the union bound, and the second inequality follows from the general fact that for any two events A, B, we have $\Pr(A \wedge B) \leq \min\{\Pr(A), \Pr(B)\}$.

The last two probabilities have been obtained along the proof of Lemma 3.15, since:

1. $f_{\ell,1}([0])$ means sampling towards avoidance of drawing an element from L_0, the likelihood of which is bounded by (39). Therefore, $\Pr(f_{\ell,1}([0]) \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)}) = \Pr(W \cap L_0 \neq \emptyset | b = 0) \leq 1 - (1 - 2^{-n^{2\beta}})^{n^{2\beta}} \cdot 2^{-n^{-2\beta/\alpha}}$
2. $f_{\ell,1}([1])$ means sampling towards drawing at least one element from $\mathcal{L}_N$, which by (38), implies $\Pr(f_{\ell,1}([1]) \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}) = \Pr(W \cap L_0 = \emptyset | b = 1) \leq 1 - (1 - 2^{-n^{2\beta}})^{n^{2\beta}} \cdot (1 - 2^{-\Omega(n^\gamma)})$.

Substituting these bounds into (41), the hypothesis of Lemma 3.17 is verified if we let ℓ grow so large that the implied value of n satisfies

$$2 - \underbrace{(1 - 2^{-n^{2\beta}})^{n^{2\beta}}}_{\to 1} \cdot \Big[\underbrace{(1 - 2^{-\Omega(n^\gamma)})}_{\to 1} + \underbrace{2^{-n^{-2\beta/\alpha}}}_{\to 1}\Big] < \frac{2}{|\mathcal{X}|^2 - |\mathcal{X}|} = 1,$$

to certify the invertibility of $f_{\ell,1}$.

Note that Lemma 3.17 asserts only that the first bit of the preimage w is determined by the image under $f_{\ell,1}$, but does so nonconstructively. That is, we only know the the action of $f_{\ell,1}$ to be either

$$[0] \mapsto \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}, \quad [1] \mapsto \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)} \tag{42}$$

$$\text{or} \quad [0] \mapsto \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)}, \quad [1] \mapsto \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)}, \tag{43}$$

where even the possibility of $f_{\ell,1}^{-1}$ being defined alternatingly by both, (42) and (43), is not precluded.

Conditional on (42), the inverse $f_{\ell,1}^{-1}$ is actually the characteristic function $\chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}$ of the language $\mathcal{L}_N$ (as defined in Lemma 3.10). However, claiming that $f_{\ell,1}^{-1} = \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}$ uniformly holds is only admissible if (42) holds for the inputs to $f_{\ell,1}$. We define this to be an event on its own in the following, denoted as

$$E_\ell := \left\{w = (b_1, \ldots, b_\ell) \in \{0,1\}^\ell : f_{\ell,1}(w) \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(b_1)}\right\}. \tag{44}$$

By construction, conditioning on E_ℓ is a rather mild and even fading away asymptotically, as told by the next result:

Lemma 3.18. *Let the event E_ℓ be defined by (44), and let A be any event in the same probability space as E_ℓ. Then,* $\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \Pr(A|E_\ell) = \Pr(A)$.

Proof. Observe that $\Pr(\neg E_\ell) = \Pr(f_{\ell,1}([0]) \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(1)} \vee f_{\ell,1}([1]) \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell^{(0)})$, and that the last expression, as was shown before, tends to zero as $\ell \to \infty$. Then, expanding $\Pr(A)$ conditional on E_ℓ and $\neg E_\ell$ into $\Pr(A) = \Pr(A|E_\ell)\Pr(E_\ell) + \Pr(A|\neg E_\ell)\Pr(\neg E_\ell)$, the claim follows from $\Pr(\neg E_\ell) \to 0$ and $\Pr(E_\ell) = 1 - \Pr(\neg E_\ell) \to 1$ when $\ell \to \infty$. □

Conditional on E_ℓ, we can state that a circuit computing $f_{\ell,1}^{-1}$ equivalently decides $\mathcal{L}_N$. But Lemma 3.10 asserts this decision to be impossible with less than a certain minimum of t steps. This, together with Lemma 3.18, will be the fundament for the concluding arguments in the next section.

3.8 Conclusion: Weak one-way functions exist

Closing in for the kill, let us now return to the original problem of proving non-emptiness of Definition 1.1 (which in turn implies P ≠ NP, unconditionally).

In the following, we let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Our final OWF f_ℓ will be a slightly modified version of (40),

$$\left.\begin{array}{rcl} f_\ell : \{0,1\}^\ell & \to & \mathcal{Y}_\ell^n, \\ (b_1,\ldots,b_n,b_{n+1},\ldots,b_\ell) & \mapsto & ([W_1],[W_2],\ldots,[W_n]), \\ \text{where } n & := & \max\left\{i \in \mathbb{N} : i^{6\beta} + 2i^{2\beta} + i \le \ell\right\}, \\ \omega_0 & := & b_{n+1}b_{n+2}\ldots b_\ell \in \{0,1\}^*, \text{ and} \\ (W_i,\omega_i) & := & \text{PTSAMP}(b_i,\omega_{i-1}) \text{ for } i = 1,2,\ldots,n. \end{array}\right\} \quad (45)$$

We proceed by checking the hypothesis of Definition 1.3 one-by-one to verify that (45) really defines a weak OWF:

- Polynomially related input and output lengths: let the length of the output be n', and note that $n' \le \text{len}(w) \cdot n^{2\beta}$ in every case. Assume that all words in the set U, from which Algorithm 3 samples, are padded up to the maximal bitlength needed for (the numeral) $n^{2\beta}$. Since $n \le \ell$, we get $n' = n \cdot n^{2\beta} \le \ell^{2\beta+1}$. Thus, $n' \le \text{poly}(\ell)$. Conversely, we can solve for ℓ to get $\ell \le (n')^{1/(2\beta+1)}$, and $\ell \le \text{poly}(n')$. Thus, f_ℓ has polynomially related input and output length.

- Length regularity of f_ℓ: Evaluating $f_\ell(w)$ means sampling from a domain U whose maximal element has magnitude $\le n^{2\beta}$, where n satisfies the bound $\ell \ge n^{6\beta} + 2n^{2\beta} + n$. Since the numeric range of U is determined by the length of the input, equally long inputs result in equally long outputs of f_ℓ. Thus, f_ℓ is length regular.

- f_ℓ can be computed by a deterministic algorithm in polynomial time: this is trivial since f_ℓ is defined by algorithm 3, which is actually a deterministic procedure that takes its random coins from its input only. Furthermore, it runs in polynomial time in n (by lemma 3.15 and the fact that n in (45) can be computed in time $\mathrm{poly}(\ell)$). Since $n \leq \ell$, the overall time-complexity is also polynomial in ℓ, so Definition 1.1 is satisfied up to including condition 1, since the (component-wise) equality of $f_\ell(w)$ and the output of Algorithm 3 demanded by Definition 1.1 is here in terms of equivalence classes and not their (random) representatives.

It remains to verify condition 2 of Definition 1.1, and Definition 1.3, respectively. This amounts to exhibiting a polynomial q so that for any polynomial[6] $\mathrm{poly}(\ell)$ (determining the size of the inversion circuit C), our constructed function is $(1-1/q(\ell), \mathrm{poly}(\ell))$-one-way for sufficiently large ℓ. Observe the order of quantifiers in Definition 1.3, which allows the minimal magnitude of ℓ to depend on all the parameters (ε, S) of the definition, especially the polynomials q and $\mathrm{poly}(\ell)$ that define $\varepsilon = 1 - 1/q$ and $S = \mathrm{poly}(\ell)$. We will keep this in mind in the following. Throughout the rest of this work, let $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)}$ denote the class of all circuits of size polynomial in ℓ.

Note that even though f_ℓ is not (required to be) bijective, the first bit b_1 in the unknown preimage $w = b_1 b_2 \dots b_\ell \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ is nevertheless uniquely pinned down upon knowledge of the first set-valued entry in our OWF's output $\{\{w_1, \dots, w_m\}, \dots\}$ (where m is computed internally by Algorithm 3). So, to clear up things and prove f_ℓ to be one-way, let us become specific on the language L_0 that we will use. To define this hard-to-decide language, we instantiate t, T as follows, where our choice is easily verified to satisfy Assumption 3.4:

- $t(x) := L_x[1, 1/2]$, where $L_x[a,b]$ is the well-known subexponential yet superpolynomial functional $L_x[a,b] := 2^{a \log(x)^b (\log\log x)^{1-b}}$,
- $T(x) := 2^x$, which is time-constructible.

Furthermore, let $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)}$ be an arbitrary circuit of polynomial size $S(\ell)$, which ought to compute any preimage in $f_\ell^{-1}(f_\ell(w))$, given $f_\ell(w)$ for $w \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ chosen uniformly at random.

Remark 3.19. *Note that constructing the diagonal language L_D with our chosen superpolynomial function t already prevents any polynomial time machine M from correctly computing a preimage bit. However, we need to be more specific on the* probability *for such a failure (the construction in the time hierarchy theorem shows only the necessity of such errors, but not its frequency).*

The event $[C(f_\ell(w)) \in f_\ell^{-1}(f_\ell(w))]$ implies that C must in particular compute b_1 correctly, since f_ℓ is bijective on its first input bit. Conversely, this means

[6] To avoid confusion with the relative density p that was used in Section 3.5, we refrain from denoting the polynomial p appearing in Definition 1.3 explicitly, and write $\mathrm{poly}(\ell)$ here instead (also to remind that the choice of p would be arbitrary anyway).

that an incorrect such computation implies the event $[C(f(w)) \notin f_\ell^{-1}(f_\ell(w))]$, and in turn

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pr_{w\in\Sigma^\ell}[C(f_\ell(w)) \notin f_\ell^{-1}(f_\ell(w))]\\ &\qquad \geq \Pr_{w\in\Sigma^\ell}[C \text{ incorrectly computes } b_1 \text{ from } f_\ell(w)],\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where b_1 denotes the first bit in w. So, we may focus our attention on the right hand side probability in the following.

Remember that we constructed our sampling algorithm to output a set $W_1 \in \mathcal{L}_N \iff b_1 = 1$ and $W_1 \notin \mathcal{L}_N \iff b_1 = 0$. Despite this, note that a correct computation of b_1 is indeed *not equivalent* to the computation of the characteristic function $\chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}$ of $\mathcal{L}_N$, since an incorrect mapping of b_1 on the output equivalence class $f_{\ell,1} = [W_1]$ is nevertheless possible (the sampling made by Algorithm 3 is still probabilistic).

So, to properly formalize the event "C correctly computes b_1", we must make our following arguments conditional on the event E_ℓ of a correct mapping, so that

$$\text{“}C \text{ correctly computes } b_1\text{”} \iff C(f_{\ell,1}(w)) = \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}(f_{\ell,1}(w))$$

and in turn

$$\text{“}C \text{ incorrectly computes } b_1\text{”} \iff C(f_{\ell,1}(w)) \neq \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}(f_{\ell,1}(w))$$

are both valid assertions in light of E_ℓ. Let us consider the second last likelihood

$$\Pr_{w\in\Sigma^\ell}(C = \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}|E_\ell) = \Pr_{w\in E_\ell}(C = \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N})$$

more closely (where the equality is due to the inclusion $E_\ell \subset \Sigma^\ell$).

If there were a circuit $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)}$ that decides $\mathcal{L}_N$, then Lemma 3.10 (more specifically its proof) gives us an injective reduction $\psi : L_0 \to \mathcal{L}_N, w \mapsto (w, w^*, w^*, \ldots)$, where w^* is a fixed word. Note that ψ can be computed by a polynomial size circuit (simply by adding hardwired multiple outputs of w^*). By this reduction, we have $w \in L_0 \iff \psi(w) \in \mathcal{L}_N$, or equivalently, $\chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}(\psi(w)) = \chi_{L_0}(w)$. Let $\psi(w)$ be a "positive case" (i.e., a word for which $C(\psi(w)) = \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}(\psi(w))$ holds), then this decision is also correctly made for L_0, using another polynomial size circuit $C' = C \circ \psi$. This means that $\Pr_{w\in E_\ell}(C(\psi(w)) = \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}(\psi(w))) \leq \Pr_{w\in E_\ell}(C'(w) = \chi_{L_0}(w))$, because ψ is injective (otherwise, it could happen that some instances of $w \overset{?}{\in} L_0$ are mapped onto the same image $\psi(w)$, which could reduce the total count). This leads to the implication

$$\begin{aligned}&[\exists C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w\in E_\ell}(C \text{ decides } \mathcal{L}_N) > \varepsilon]\\ &\qquad\qquad \to [\exists C' \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w\in E_\ell}(C' \text{ decides } L_0) > \varepsilon],\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where the abbreviation "C decides L" is a shorthand for C computing the characteristic function of L (the free variable $\varepsilon > 0$ is $\forall$-quantified, but omitted here to ease our notation).

Similarly, assuming the existence of a circuit $C' \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)}$ that decides L_0, Lemma 3.7 gives us another mapping $\varphi : L_D \to L_0$ for which φ modifies the right half of its input string accordingly so that $\varphi(w)$ becomes a square, while retaining the left part of w that determines membership of w in L_D. Thus, $w \in L_D \iff \varphi(w) \in L_0$, or equivalently, $\chi_{L_0}(\varphi(w)) = \chi_{L_D}(w)$. This mapping is also injective, so we reach a similar implication as (47) by the same token, which is

$$\begin{aligned}[\exists C' \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C' \text{ decides } L_0) > \varepsilon] \\ \to [\exists C'' \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C'' \text{ decides } L_D) > \varepsilon],\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

in which $C'' = C' \circ \varphi$ is of polynomial size, since φ can be computed in polynomial time (and therefore is also computable by a polynomial size circuit).

Upon chaining (47) and (48) and switching to the converse implication (with negated sides), we get

$$[\forall C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C = \chi_{L_D}) \leq \varepsilon] \to [\forall C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C = \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}) \leq \varepsilon],$$

and by taking the likelihoods for the converse events with $\delta = 1 - \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}[\forall C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C \neq \chi_{L_D}) \geq \delta] \\ \to [\forall C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{poly}(\ell)} : \Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C \neq \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}) \geq \delta],\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

using the notation $C = \chi$ and $C \neq \chi$ to mean that C correctly or incorrectly decides the respective language.

Thus, to prove that every circuit of polynomial size will incorrectly decide $\mathcal{L}_N$, and therefore incorrectly recover the first input bit b_1, conditional on E_ℓ, we need to lower-bound the likelihood for a polynomial-size circuit to err on deciding L_D, and get rid of the conditioning on E_ℓ. Lemma 3.18 helps with the latter, as we get an $\ell_0 > 0$ so that for all $\ell > \ell_0$,

$$\Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C \neq \chi_{L_D}) = \Pr_{w \in \Sigma^*}(C \neq \chi_{L_D} | E_\ell) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \Pr_{w \in \Sigma^*}(C \neq \chi_{L_D}) \tag{50}$$

Remark 3.20. *Two further intuitive reasons for the convergence of* $\Pr_{w \in \Sigma^*}(C \neq \chi_{L_D}) \to \Pr_{w \in \Sigma^*}(C \neq \chi_{L_D} | E_\ell)$ *can be given: first, note that our consideration of the decision on* L_D *is focused on the first bit* b_1*, while the event* E_ℓ *is determined by the other bits* $b_n, b_{n+1}, \ldots$ *of the input, where* $n > 1$*. Since these are stochastically independent of* b_1*, the related events are also independent. Second, the selection algorithm is constructed to take elements disregarding their particular inner structure, and hence independent of the condition* $w \in L_D$*. Thus, the event of a correct selection (*E_ℓ*) is independent of the event* $w \in L_D$*.*

Because C is by definition an acyclic graph, the computation of $C(w)$ can be done by a TM via evaluating all gates in the topological sort order of (the graph-representation of) C. Moreover, it is easy to design a universal such circuit interpreter TM M_{UC} taking a description of a circuit C and a word w as input to compute $C(w)$ in time poly(size(C)). In our case, since C has size(C) = $S(\ell)$, where S is a polynomial, the simulation of C by M_{UC} takes polynomial time $\geq S(\ell)$ again.

Remembering our notation from Section 3.2, we write M_w for the TM being represented by a word $w \in \Sigma^*$. Likewise, let us write M_C for the TM that merely runs the universal circuit interpreter machine M_{UC} on the description of the circuit C. If, for some word w and circuit C, M_w and M_C compute the same function on all Σ^*, we write $M_w \equiv_f M_C$ (to mean "functional equivalence" of M_w and M_C). With this notation, let the event "$M_C \neq \chi$" be defined identically to "$C \neq \chi$".

To quantify the right-hand side probability in (50), let us return to the proof of Theorem 3.5 again: the key insight is that the language L_D is defined to include all words w for which the TM M_w would reject "itself", i.e., w, as input, and has enough time to carry to completion. Since the TM M_C that equivalently represents the circuit C above would accept its own string representation w but L_D is defined to *exclude* exactly this word, M_C (and therefore also C) would incorrectly compute the output for at least all words that represent sufficiently large encodings of M_C. Formally,

$$\Pr_{w \in \Sigma^*}(C \neq \chi_{L_D}) \geq \frac{\left|\left\{w \in \Sigma^\ell : M_w \equiv_f M_C\right\}\right|}{2^\ell} \overset{(9)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{2^{\ell - \log \ell}}{2^\ell} = \frac{1}{2\ell},$$

where we have used the (wasteful) encoding of TMs introduced in Section 3.2. Plugging this into (50) tells us that

$$\Pr_{w \in \Sigma^*}(C \neq \chi_{L_D} | E_\ell) \geq \frac{1}{4\ell}, \tag{51}$$

which is a universal bound that is independent of the particular circuit C. So, let C be arbitrary and of polynomial size $\leq S(\ell)$. We use implication (49) with (51), to conclude $\Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C \neq \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}) \geq 1/(4\ell)$. The actual interest, however, is on the *unconditional* likelihood of C outputting b_1 incorrectly. For that matter, we invoke Lemma 3.18 on (46), to obtain a value $\ell_1 > 0$ so that for all $\ell > \ell_1$,

$$\Pr_{w \in \Sigma^\ell}[C \text{ incorrectly computes } b_1 \text{ from } f_\ell(w)] \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \Pr_{w \in E_\ell}(C \neq \chi_{\mathcal{L}_N}) \geq \frac{1}{8\ell}.$$

By taking the converse probabilities again in (46), we end up with

$$\Pr_{w \in \Sigma^\ell}[C(f_\ell(w)) \in f_\ell^{-1}(f_\ell(w))] < 1 - \frac{1}{8\ell},$$

for all $\ell > \max\{\ell_0, \ell_1\}$ and every circuit C of polynomial size $S(\ell)$.

References

[1] Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[2] B. Bollobás and A. Thomason. Threshold functions. *Combinatorica*, 7(1):35–38, 1986.

[3] Hans Hermes. *Aufzählbarkeit – Entscheidbarkeit – Berechenbarkeit*. Springer, 2nd edition, 1971.

[4] J. E. Hopcroft and J. D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages and Computation*. Addison Wesley, 1979.

[5] Christos H. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley, 1994.

[6] M. Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. PWS Publishing, 3rd edition, 2013.

[7] Marius Zimand. *Compuational Complexity: A Quantitative Approach*. North-Holland Mathematical Studies 196. Elsevier, 2004.